SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, April 3, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, April 3, 1969, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; Thomas J. Mellon (Virgil L. Elliott); Mrs. Charles B. Porter, and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Commissioners William M. Brinton and Walter S. Newman.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director of Planning-Implementation; Ralph Mead, Planner IV, Zoning; Roland Haney, Planner III; Edward Michael, Planner III; Daniel Sullivan, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

REFERRAL:

R69.18 Mini-park at Laguna and Page Streets.

Thomas Malloy, Mini-Park Program Coordinator, explained the mini-park program to which San Francisco is now committed and described the criteria which were being used for the selection of mini-park sites. Subsequently, he commented on the specific site presently being considered by the Commission as follows:

> "The subject vacant parcel is located on the southerly side of Page Street, 55 feet east of Laguna Street with a double frontage on Rose Street. This lot is 55 feet by 120 feet having a total of 6,600 square feet. It is zoned R-4. Appraisals have been prepared by the Real Estate Department and an independent appraiser; the Director of Property recommends the acquisition.
>
> The nearest existing Recreation and Park facility is the Hayes Valley Playground to the north at Hayes and Buchanan Streets which is designed to accommodate older children with facilities such as basketball courts. The two other Recreation and Park facilities nearest the site, Duboce Park and Alamo Square, do not conveniently lend themselves

to the needs of small children or mothers with infants in the Page-Laguna area. The Recreation and Park Commission by Resolution 7888 adopted on March 27, 1969, has unanimously recommended the acquisition of Lot 15, Assessor's Block 852, for park purposes.

This particular site is incorporated as Metropolitan Mini-Park #6 in the approved application to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development for an Open Space Grant. It is intended that the parcel will be developed with a play area designed for small children, landscaping and also a separative passive recreation area to serve the needs of the elderly. The site has a very good sun exposure.

Acquisition of the subject parcel is in conformity with Objective No. 1 of the Recreation and Park Area Location Plan of the Public Facilities Section of the Master Plan:

"The provision of areas for active and passive recreation for all age groups, equitably distributed throughout the city."

and also with Principle 1 of the Plan:

"Playlots, designed for children of pre-school age, and each containing a sandbox, play apparatus, and a mothers' sitting area, should be available within 1/8 to 1/4 mile of every residence in the high-density and medium-density sections of sections of the community areas."

Since this is the first parcel specifically to be acquired for Mini-Park purposes, it has been brought separately to the Commission's attention. A general referral governing the Mini-Park Program will be submitted to the Commission at a later date."

Mr. Malloy also informed the Commission that a letter had been received from the Page-Laguna Neighborhood Association endorsing the concept of developing the subject site as a mini-park for mothers with infant children and for elderly people; and they had offered suggestions as to the type of improvements which they felt should be installed in the mini-park.

Commissioner Porter asked if there are a great number of small children in the subject neighborhood. Mr. Malloy replied in the affirmative.

President Fleishhacker asked if the Recreation and Park Department would be responsible for maintaining the mini-park once it has been developed. Mr. Malloy again responded in the affirmative.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that aquisition of the subject property for park purposes be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the Director of Planning be authorized to report that the acquisition for park purposes of Lot 15, Block 852, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

REVIEW OF LATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS SUBMISSIONS

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, described 22 projects which had been presented by the San Francisco Port Commission, indicating that the cost of those projects would total $4 million dollars to be financed from Port revenues. Since the transfer of the Port to the City and County had not become effective until February 7, the 22 projects had not been included in the full capital improvement program reviewed by the City Planning Commission on January 10, 1969; however, following the transfer of the Port, the projects had been submitted as supplemental budget requests. He stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had evaluated the projects in the context of the relevant broad policy of the Master Plan and of those recommendations of the Northern Waterfront Plan which appear to have strong public support. The various projects had been given ratings of essential, hold, not applicable, or, in cases where inadequate specific information has been provided, use of the symbol N/R indicating that no recommendation had yet been assigned.

Commissioner Porter asked what would happen to the projects for which the staff of the Department of City Planning had not recommended priority classifications. Mr. Steele replied that final decisions on those projects would have to be made by the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee.

Commissioner Kearney asked for more information regarding project 775.69.120 calling for modernization of street lighting at specific areas along the Embarcadero.

John Yeomans, Controller of the Port Commission, replied that it was the intention of his Commission to improve the lighting all along the Embarcadero over a period of time. The first phase of the project to be budgeted, however, had placed primary emphasis on the area in the vicinity of the Ferry Building. Subsequently, referring to the question raised earlier by Commissioner Porter regarding the responsibility of the Commission for making policy recommendations for the various projects submitted by the Port Authority, he suggested that it might be desirable to ask the City Attorney to comment on that point.

The Director stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning would be able to make recommendations regarding priorities in the future; however, because of the short period of time which the staff had had for review of the projects presently being considered, and because inadequate information had been furnished in some cases, the staff had felt like it was not able to make responsible recommendations concerning certain of the projects at the present time. He expected that more information would be available to the Capital Improvements Advisory Committe to enable that Committee to make recommendations regarding priorities for all of the projects; and, since the Commission's recommendations were only advisory in nature, he did not feel that use of the N/R symbol indicating no recommendation would be detrimental to the interests of the Port Commission.

Commissioner Mellon, chairman of the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee, stated that his Committee normally relies on the recommendation of the City Planning Commission for guidance; however, because of the circumstances of the present case, he felt that the recommendation of the Director of Planning should be followed.

Mr. Yeomans, noting that the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended a "hold" rating for project 775.69.101 which called for repairing the sub-structure of and installing

protection on wood pilings at Pier 45, stated that he had been advised by the Port Commission's chief engineer that the pilings of that pier would have to be repaired no matter who the future tenant of the pier may be; and, if the project were to be deferred as recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning, the cost of making the repairs would probably be much greater at a later date.

Mr. Steele remarked that the configuration of the pier may change in the future depending on the requirements of its new tenant; and, under the circumstances, he did not feel that the Commission should recommend the expenditure of funds for improvement of the pier until a definite decision has been made regarding future use of the facility.

President Fleishhacker asked if he were correct in understanding that the project calling for repair of Pier 45 had been questioned only because future use of the pier will be for some unknown non-maritime purpose. The Director replied in the affirmative; and, in any case, he indicated that the Commission could reconsider the project within the year if agreement is reached with a new tenant for use of the pier.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the projects submitted by the Port Commission be approved as in conformity with the land use section of the Master Plan with the general priority ratings recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

Subsequently, Mr. Steele reviewed late capital improvement project submissions which had been made by the Youth Guidance Center, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department. He stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning was recommending that the project submitted by the Department of Public Works, calling for construction of rock fall areas and a concrete bulkhead in an unimproved street area along Green Street between Sansome and Montgomery Streets on the east slope of Telegraph Hill be given a priority rating of "essential". "Hold" ratings were being recommended for the Youth Guidance Center project and for the Recreation and Park Department project which called for the installation of chain link fencing along the 22nd Street frontage and along a portion of the Arkansas Street frontage of the Potrero Hill Playground.

that there had been serious vandalism and littering problems in the vicinity of the Potrero Hill Playground; and, under the circumstances, she felt that the chain link fencing which had been recommended by the Recreation and Park Department might be desirable.

Mr. Malloy advised Mrs. Evers that money would be made available from the Urban Beautification grant to improve the northeast corner of the Potrero Hill Playground and to improve the adjacent portion of 22nd Street with paths and special lighting. It was believed that those projects would alleviate the problems which Mrs. Evers had mentioned; and, if so, installation of the chain link fencing might not be necessary or desirable.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Wight, and carried unanimously that action on the three projects described by Mr. Steele be taken in accordance with the recommendations which had been made by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

2:30 p. m. -- Zoning Hearing

ZM69.8 119 Broadway, southeast corner of Battery Street; C-2 to a C-M or C-3-O District and change of height limit from 84 feet to 200 feet.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Zoning Administrator, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had requested that the subject property be reclassified and that the height limit be changed from 84 feet to 200 feet to allow the construction of a high-rise hotel on the site.

Robert Armen, attorney for the applicant, believed that use of the subject site for a new hotel would meet the tests of public convenience and general welfare which serve as the basis of City Planning Commission actions. He felt that construction of the Golden Gateway Center had created a need for a hotel facility in the subject neighborhood. Furthermore, current statistics seemed to indicate that hotels in San Francisco have an 86 percent occupancy factor; and, since that occupancy factor is higher than in most other cities of comparable size, he believed that there is a general need for new hotels in the City. Under the circumstances, he urged the Commission to approve the subject application so that it would be possible to construct a hotel on his client's property.

Commissioner Porter asked if Mr. Armen could elaborate on the type of hotel planned for the site and if he could advise the Commission on the identity of the proposed developer. Mr. Armen replied that his client, Mr. Edmundson, had built a number of hotels for the Howard Johnson Corp.; and he expected that a hotel of that type was being considered.

Emil W. Stiefvater, owner of the subject property, remarked that a 25-story apartment house will be built on the block below his property; and he estimated that the Diamond National Printing Company, located on the other side of his property, is at least 200 feet high.

Mrs. John Coyle, representing the Telegraph Hill Dwellers Association, stated that her organization was very much opposed to both the proposed reclassification and the change in height limit. If the existing 84-foot height limit were to be removed from the subject lot, she felt that the City might as well have no height limits anywhere; and she was particularly opposed to the requested change in height limit since the request seemed to have so little justification. The requested zone change would constitute "spot zoning" since most of the surrounding properties are zoned M-1, R-4, or C-2. Consequently, members of her organization were opposed to the requested reclassification, also.

Donald J. Kropp, attorney for the Russian Hill Association, stated that members of his organization were violently opposed to the applicant's proposal which would result in the construction of another high-rise building which would block off views of the Bay from Russian Hill. He also noted that the Howard Johnson Corporation had recently announced plans for constructing a new hotel at Van Ness and Market Streets; and, under those circumstances, he questioned whether that firm was actually considering construction of a second hotel on the subject site.

Mrs. Kenneth Evers, property owner on Telegraph Hill, stated that she would be unaffected by the proposed building since she lives on the north side of the Hill. However, she thought that the preservation of Telegraph Hill as an entity should be considered to be an important objective; and, if a series of applications such as the one presently being considered were to be approved, Telegraph Hill would be left with no protection at all. Furthermore, if more and more skyscrapers were to be built for apartments, hotels, and offices, she believed that families would eventually be driven out

of San Francisco; and, as a result, the City would be faced with serious tax problems. She noted that the applicant proposed to construct a hotel on the subject site to accommodate tourists; however, if the amenities of the City are continually reduced by the construction of such buildings, fewer tourists will come to San Francisco and the new hotels being constructed will not be needed. She felt that approval of the subject application would benefit only the applicant and not the citzens of San Francisco; and, for that reason, she urged that the application be disapproved.

A member of the audience called attention to the fact that new hotels had been proposed for both the International Market Center and the Embarcadero Center; and he believed that those hotels would adequately serve the needs generated by the Golden Gateway Center.

Mrs. Hans Klussman, representing San Francisco Beautiful, doubted that the Diamond National Building mentioned by Mr. Stiefvater rises to a height of more than 70 feet. In any case, she felt that areas such as Jackson Square should be protected; and, if the subject application were to be approved, that area would be endangered. In conclusion, she remarked that San Francisco's sidewalks are becoming terribly congested, particularly during rush hours; and she felt that construction of a high-rise building on the subject site would add unnecessarily to that congestion.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended strongly that the subject application be disapproved. The requested reclassification would result in "spot zoning"; and neither a change of zone nor a change in the existing height limit would be necessary for the construction of a hotel on the subject site. In fact, he noted that another property owner on Broadway is preparing to build a new hotel in a 65-foot height limit district. He commented on the fact that both the existing zoning classification and height limit had been adopted only recently by the Board of Supervisors; and during the interim, no changes had taken place in the subject neighborhood which would justify approval of the change requested in the subject application. He believed that the proposed spot zoning would give unfair development advantages to the subject property and that it would be detrimental to the preservation of existing scale characterized by the 65-foot height limits on the Jackson Square-North Beach area immediately west of the subject property; and it would allow greater density on the subject site than is presently permitted in the Golden Gateway residential

development to the south and east which is controlled by a maximum floor area ratio of 4 to 1. Subsequently, he submitted a draft resolution of disapproval for consideration by the Commission and recommended its adoption.

Mr. Armen believed that approval of the subject application would not establish a precedent since the Commission would be under no obligation to approve similar applications in the future. He felt that the height in and of itself should not be considered to be ugly or bad. He disagreed that approval of the subject application would benefit only the applicants and not the citizens of San Francisco since he felt that it was obvious that additional hotel facilities are needed in San Francisco; and the fact that other hotels are being built was of little significance since they would not begin to meet the City's needs for additional hotel facilities are needed in San Francisco; and the fact that other hotels are being built was of little significance since they would not begin to meet the City's needs for additional hotel facilities. He stated that the law provides that people who have a case and who are able to establish certain findings are entitled to the changes of zone which they may request; and, under the circumstances, he felt that the subject application should be approved.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6354 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

ZM69.9 363-75 Ninth Avenue, west line, 125 feet north of Geary Boulevard; and a portion of the existing Pacific Telephone Company parking lot on Tenth Avenue, east line, 99 feet north of Geary Boulevard.
R-3 to a C-2 district.

CU69.16 363-75 Ninth Avenue, west line, 125 feet north of Geary Boulevard; request for a parking lot in an R-3 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the Pacific Telephone Company had requested reclassification of the subject Lots from R-3 to C-2 to allow construction of a new telephone communication equipment building on the Tenth Avenue parcel and a parking lot for the Telephone Company on the Ninth Avenue parcel, or, in lieu of reclassification of the Ninth Avenue parcel, a conditional use parking lot; and he indicated that the new communication equipment building would also occupy

a C-2 zoned Telephone Company parking lot on Geary Boulevard adjacent to the west of the existing Telephone Building. The new building would be designed initially as a one-floor building over a basement; however, it could eventually be extended to a height of three floors over a basement. The parking lot, which would be entered solely from Ninth Avenue, would accomodate 38 cars to meet the parking requirements of the City Planning Code for the proposed new building, including future expansion.

Mr. Morris, representing the Pacific Telephone Company, stated that the new building would be required to house equipment which would be needed to provide adequate service for the subject neighborhood. He believed that the proposed building would probably not reach its ultimate height of three stories for eight or ten years.

Madeline C. Prosser, 362 Tenth Avenue, read a letter which she had previously submitted to the Commission. In the letter, she noted that residents of the neighborhood had appeared before the City Planning Commission in 1961 to protest an application which would have allowed the Pacific Telephone Company to have exits from their parking lot on both Tenth Avenue and Ninth Avenue; and, as a result, the Telephone Company had agreed that the exit from their parking lot should be on Geary Boulevard because of the hazard which exits on Ninth or Tenth Avenues would pose for school children attending the Star of the Sea School. The present application, however, would nullify that previous agreement by allowing construction of an exit from the new parking lot onto Ninth Avenue. The subject block is basically residential in character; and she felt that abutting property owners would not relish the thought of having any trucking equipment stored on the subject properties since the motors of such vehicles can be very disturbing, particularly when the trucks are started at night. Under the circumstances, she felt that the Telephone Company should be required to store its vehicles in areas which are already zoned for commercial use.

Donald Chew, 370 Tenth Avenue, objected to the Telephone Company's request for reclassification of property presently zoned R-3 to C-2.

Richard Trauner, 374 Tenth Avenue, stated that he lives adjacent to the Telephone Company's existing parking lot; and he advised the Commission that he had often been disturbed by the noise of the Telephone Company trucks at night and in the early morning hours. He also objected to the use of either Ninth or Tenth

[illegible] and Telephone Company parking lot on Cherry Boulevard adjacent to the rear of the existing Telephone building; the new building would be designed initially as a one-story building over a basement; however, it would eventually be extended to [illegible] stories over a basement. The parking lot, which would have been solely for [illegible], would accommodate [illegible] to meet the parking requirements of the City Planning Code for the proposed new building, including future expansion.

Mr. Harris, representing the Pacific Telephone Company, stated that the new building would be [illegible] to house equipment which would be needed to provide adequate service for the [illegible] neighborhood. He believed that the proposed building would probably not result in [illegible] of the [illegible].

Madeline C. [illegible], 362 [illegible] Avenue, read a letter which she had previously submitted to the Commission. In the letter she noted that residents of the neighborhood had appeared before the City Planning Commission in 1956 to protest an application which would have allowed the Pacific Telephone Company to [illegible] cars [illegible] and, as a result, the Telephone Company had agreed that [illegible] from their parking lot [illegible] backyard [illegible] children [illegible] the pressure [illegible]; however, [illegible] that gentleman's agreement [illegible] constructed [illegible] an exit from the parking lot onto [illegible]. The [illegible] block is [illegible] residential in character [illegible] felt that allowing [illegible] would not [illegible] having any [illegible] on the [illegible] property [illegible] the motors of [illegible] very disturbing, particularly when the trucks [illegible] at night. [illegible] felt that the Telephone Company should be required to [illegible] vehicles in [illegible] already [illegible] for commercial use.

[illegible] Chan, 37 [illegible] Avenue, objected to the Telephone Company's request for reclassification of property from R-3 to C-2.

Richard [illegible], 3[illegible] Lyon Avenue, stated that he [illegible] objected to the Telephone Company's parking lot [illegible] noted the [illegible] would [illegible] disturbed by the noise of the Telephone Company [illegible] at night [illegible]. He also objected to [illegible] of [illegible].

Avenue for exits from the proposed parking lot because the additional traffic congestion would create a greater hazard for students of the Star of the Sea School. It was his understanding that the Telephone Company had a storage garage in the vicinity of Commonwealth Avenue; and he felt that it would be better if the trucks were to be stored at the location rather than on the subject property. He stated that he and other residents of the subject neighborhood were anxious to preserve the residential character of the area; and, for that reason, he objected to the proposed reclassification of the subject property from R-3 to C-2.

Mr. Wilson supported the arguments of other individuals who had spoken in opposition to extension of the Geary Street commercial district into the residential area to the north. He felt that that kind of so-called progress should be spelled "progre$$;" and, in his opinion, approval of the requested reclassification would not further progress, betterment, or improvement. Expansion of the commercial district into the adjacent residential area would degrade the residential area and endanger its inhabitants; and he felt that the expansion should not be allowed.

Mr. Steele recommended approval of the request for reclassification of that portion of the subject property which would be used for construction of the new building and disapproval of the requested reclassification of the portion of the property which would be used as a parking lot. He also recommended that the conditional use application be approved to allow development of the parking lot as a conditional use under the present R-3 zoning classification subject to six specific conditions. He felt that the need for expansion of telephone service equipment space at the subject site had been clearly demonstrated; and he was convinced that the only practical manner of accomplishing such expansion would be to build a new building adjacent to the existing equipment building on Geary Boulevard even though that approach would require the use of a small portion of the property which is presently zoned R-3. He noted that the proposed new building would be designed to be in scale with buildings in the subject neighborhood; and, because of its location, it would not add commercial traffic to the residential portion of Tenth Avenue. Much of the existing Telephone Company parking lot would have to be displaced to accomodate the new equipment building; and the new parking lot which was being proposed would provide the off-street parking spaces required by the City Planning Code to serve the needs of the employees in the existing and proposed equipment buildings. He distributed two draft resolutions for consideration by the Commission and recommended their adoption.

Mr. Morris stated that he regretted that he had not indicated earlier that the proposed parking lot would be used only for employees' cars and not for the storage of trucks which would henceforth be parked in another area. With regard to the safety of school children, he indicated that he had described the Telephone Company's plans to the Principal of the Star of the Sea School who had advised him that she found the plans to be satisfactory from a safety standpoint. In conclusion, he stated that he had reviewed the draft resolutions which had been prepared by Mr. Steele and had found them both to be acceptable. Therefore, he hoped that they would be adopted by the Commission.

Mrs. Prosser asked if any assurance could be given that the Telephone Company would not return at a later date to request additional changes in the proposed use of the subject site. President Fleishhacker replied that all property owners are allowed to file applications for conditional use authorization or for changes of zone at any time; and, under the circumstances, no guarantee could be given that use of the subject property owned by the Telephone Company would not be changed at a later date.

Commissioner Porter pointed out, however, that authorization for the parking lot could be withdrawn if the Telephone Company failed to meet the standards set by the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

Mr. Morris confirmed that the Telephone Company had previously agreed not to have exits from its parking lot onto Ninth or Tenth Avenues. However, the parking lot in question at that time would be replaced by the new equipment building which was being proposed; and there would be no way of providing access to the new parking area except from Ninth Avenue. He emphasized, however, that the nature of the parking lot would be changed insofar as it would be used only for the parking of automobiles belonging to employees of the Telephone Company and not for the storage of trucks.

Commissioner Kearney asked if he were correct in understanding that four older houses would have to be torn down to accommodate the proposed development. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative indicating that the four houses contain a total of nine dwelling units.

Commissioner Porter asked if the conditions contained in the draft resolution specified that storage of trucks on the proposed parking lot would not be allowed. Since Mr. Morris had indicated that he would be willing to stipulate that the parking lot would not be used for the storage of trucks, she felt that such a condition should be included in the draft resolution. Mr. Steele replied that Condition No. 6 of the draft resolution included that prohibition by reference.

Commissioner Porter suggested that prohibition on storage of trucks be stated explicity in the draft resolution; and, therefore, she suggested that Condition No. 6 of the draft resolution should be amended to read as follows:

"The use of the lot shall comply to the use provisions of the City Planning Code as it applies to the parking of commercial vehicles, prohibiting storage of trucks in an open conditional use parking lot in a residential district."

Commissioner Kearney asked if it would be possible for the Telephone Company to construct its new building on the Ninth Avenue property and to continue to use the property fronting on Geary Boulevard as a parking lot. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative; but he indicated that he would question the desirability of locating the new building on Ninth Avenue.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried 4 to 1 that Resolution no. 6355 be adopted and that application No. ZM69.9 be approved in part and disapproved in part. Commissioners Fleishhacker, Mellon, Porter, and Wight voted Aye; Commissioner Kearney voted No.

Subsequently it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried 4 to 1 that Resolution No. 6356 be adopted and that use of the Pacific Telephone Company's residentially zoned property on Ninth Avenue for a parking lot be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution as modified. Commissioners Fleishhacker, Mellon, Porter, and Wight voted Aye; Commissioner Kearney voted No.

ZT69.2 Public hearing on proposed amendment of Section 225 of the City Planning Code, and other sections as appropriate, to permit junk yards as conditional uses in M-1 and M-2 districts.

(Under advisement from meeting of February 6, 1969)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, noted that this matter had been taken under advisement from the Commission's meeting of February 6, 1969, to enable members of the staff of the Department of City Planning to meet with representatives of the automobile wrecking industry in an effort to seek agreement on a set of proposals. Discussions had been held with representatives of the automobile wrecking industry; and substantial agreement had been reached on many points. Accordingly, the staff of the Department of City Planning had prepared revised versions of the proposed ordinance and of the proposed guidelines to be used by the Commission in considering conditional use applications for automobile wrecking yards. The substance of the changes which had been made were as follows:

> Revisions to proposed ordinance. The principal change is that wrecking yards would no longer be a "temporary use" limited to a maximum period of five years (subject to renewal). Strong opposition was expressed to "temporary use" treatment in the ordinance, and the staff feels that if a time limit is called for in an individual case, the Commission's general conditional use authority remains sufficient to impose such a limit. Accordingly, the pertinent language has been deleted from Section 225(q), and Section 119.3(b) has been eliminated.
>
> The provision that complete enclosure within a building may be required has also been deleted from Section 225 (q), as it is deemed unnecessary. The question of enclosure has now been handled by combining Section 225(p) with Section 225(q) so that auto wrecking operations of all kinds, including both yards and enclosed buildings, come under the same Code Section. This approach is more convenient administratively. Since a conditional use application would automatically cover any type of auto wrecking operation, if the applicant changed his mind about the degree of enclosure desired during the course of the proceedings, no new application would be required.
>
> As in the previous proposal, existing auto wrecking yards would be allowed to continue at the same location without being immediately

subject to any controls; however, under Section 225(q) they would now be required to apply for conditional use status in order to continue beyond a two year period. This requirement is desirable as a matter of equity between those operations starting at new locations and those remaining in existing locations, and also reflects a strong public policy of greater control over all auto wrecking operations, since it provides a two year grace period; even after that period, the Commission could allow further time under the conditional use authorization, or otherwise avoid potential hardship to the applicant.

Revisions to proposed guidelines. To conform with changes in the proposed ordinance as described above, the guideline on "Time Limits" has been rewritten and the guideline on "Enclosure" has been deleted. The guideline on "Fencing" has been revised so that uniformity and new materials are no longer required, and gates need not be solid or of the same material as the fence. The previous proposal was not realistic in all cases; in particular, a uniform fence or solid gate would not be appropriate if a varying open-closed pattern were desired for purposes of visibility and security. The guideline on "Requirements of other Departments" has been changed so that other surfacing besides gravel or hardtop may be permitted if the appropriate City Departments concur."

Alan B. Axelrod, attorney for the San Francisco Automobile Dismantlers, confirmed that representatives of the automobile wrecking industry had met on two occasions with the staff of the Department of City Planning; and he felt that both sides had learned a great deal as a result of those meetings. However, in the interim since the last meeting with the staff of the Department of City Planning, the text of the proposed ordinance had been revised to contain certain provisions to which the automobile wreckers were opposed. When it was agreed that wrecking yards should no longer be classed as "temporary uses" limited to a maximum period of five years, members of the industry had understood that wrecking yards would be designated as "principal uses" which would be different from other principal uses only in that they would be subject to certain guidelines. Instead, the revised ordinance would still continue to

treat automobile wrecking yards as conditional uses.

Mr. Axelrod noted that approximately 400 uses are specifically cited in the City Planning Code; and, of those uses, only 20 are designated as conditional uses. Most of the 20 conditional uses specified are types of uses which cause pollution; and he pointed out that that is not characteristic of autombile wrecking yards. He had understood that the principal objection of the staff of the Department of City Planning to automobile wrecking yards was aesthetic in nature; and he agreed that automobile wrecking yards may be unattractive to look when they are unfenced. However, he felt that the guidelines which were being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning for development of automobile wrecking yards would solve that problem. As a result, he was convinced that the City Planning Commission could deal effectively with automobile wrecking yards without classifying them as conditional uses.

Mr. Axelrod also remarked that some of the members of the automobile wrecking industry had begun to feel less than optimistic about their future in San Francisco; and they believed that classification of automobile wrecking yards as conditional uses would provide an instrument which could be used to put an end to the industry in the City. Furthermore, while the original draft ordinance had provided that existing automobile wrecking yards would be allowed to continue operation for a period of five years without being subject to any new controls, the revised draft of the ordinance had been changed to require existing wrecking yards to apply for conditional use status at the end of a two-year period. That change had not been discussed to any significant extent with representatives of the industry; and they felt that the two-year limitation would cause unnecessary and unjustified hardship and that it might, in fact, be illegal.

In conclusion, Mr. Axelrod noted that an article had appeared in the newspaper last Sunday commenting upon the number of abandoned cars which are found on the streets of San Francisco and describing the important role played by the automobile wreckers in removing those automobiles. Under the circumstances, he hoped that the City Planning Commission, in taking action on the proposed ordinance, would make a statement endorsing the importance of the automobile industry to San Francisco.

John J. Dorsey, President of the San Francisco Automobile Dismantler's Association, stated that most of the automobile

made by the institution
would be desirable to hold such classes somewhere
[illegible]

made by the institution
would be desirable to hold such classes somewhere
[illegible]

dismantlers are small businessmen, the majority of whom are presently located in Butchertown. Under the circumstances, most of the automobile dismantlers were facing the problem of relocation; and that problem would be made even more difficult if the legislation presently under consideration were to be approved by the City Planning Commission. He stated that the automobile dismantlers would be interested in establishing an industrial park which would conform to the guidelines recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning; however, for various reasons, such a project seemed to be unfeasible.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, stated that the problem of automobile wrecking yards is not simply a matter of aesthetics; and he indicated that other factors such as traffic contribute an undesirable character to the use which should be subject to controls such as thosebbeing recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning. In preparing the suggested guidelines to be used by the Commission in reviewing conditional use applications for automobile wrecking yards, the staff had been as liberal as possible; and he did not feel that those guidelines should be any further attenuated. Furthermore, while Mr. Axelrod had objected to designation of automobile wrecking as a conditional use, he emphasized that the Commission would have no power to enforce the proposed guidelines unless new automobile wrecking yards were to be required to obtain conditional use authorization from the Commission. If automobile wrecking yards were declared to be principal uses, they could be installed without being reviewed by the Commission; and the Commission would have no power to require their removal if they should fail to meet the proposed guidelines.

The Director concurred that the automobile wreckers do provide a vital service; however, he stressed that the service which they provide is no more vital than other services in San Francisco which are treated as conditional uses. In fact, he noted that other cities have flatly prohibited automobile wrecking yards. He commented on the fact that the ordinance proposed by the staff of the Department of City Planning would allow automobile wrecking yards as conditional uses in M-1 districts where they are not allowed at all at the present time; and he felt that such a recommendation in itself gave evidence of the fact that the staff does consider automobile wrecking to be a vital industry. He also acknowledged that difficulties are being faced by the industry because of the imminent removal of many of the automobile wrecking yards from the Butchertown Redevelopment Project Area; yet, in selecting sites for those displaced facilities, he thought that it was extremely

important that care should be taken to assure that the new wrecking yards will not have a detrimental effect on their new neighbors. Under the circumstances, he felt that it was essential that automobile wrecking yards should be looked upon as special uses requiring special consideration by the Commission. In conclusion, he stated that he could not recommend any further modifications of the proposed ordinance beyond those which had been negotiated during the interim since the Commission's first hearing of the matter on February 6.

Commissioner Mellon asked how the matter of setting standards for automobile wrecking yards had originally come before the City Planning Commission. President Fleishhacker replied that the project had been initiated by the Department of City Planning.

Commissioner Mellon then asked if the purposes of the proposed legislation had been to formulate standards which would improve both the operation and the appearance of the automobile wrecking industry. Mr. Jacobs replied that appearance was one of the factors which had been of concern to the staff; however, the staff had also been aware that many automobile wrecking yards would be displaced from the Butchertown Redevelopment Project Area and had been concerned about where and under what conditions the wrecking yards might be relocated. For so long as automobile wrecking yards were to be restricted to M-2 districts, the number of sites available for relocation would be quite limited; yet, if automobile wrecking yards were to be allowed in M-1 districts, it seemed vitally important that conditions should be established to govern their installation. He noted that eleven out of fourteen cities and counties in the Bay Area are already treating automobile wrecking yards as conditional uses; and, under the circumstances, he felt that it was apparent that the staff of the Department of City Planning was not being arbitrary in the recommendations which it had prepared.

The Secretary read a letter which had been received from M. Justin Herman, Executive Director of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, which read in part as follows:

> "We believe the proposed amendment is a major improvement over the present provisions of the City Planning Code. However, we would suggest that one year is adequate time to allow for the required conditional use permit.
>
> The official policy of the City and County of San Francisco is to develop the Butchertown Project Area as an industrial resource and thereby

create urgently needed job opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed residents of the Bayview Hunters Point Community. This policy has been established through formal actions by the City Planning Commission, the Redevelopment Agency, the Board of Supervisors, and the Mayor. For a multitude of reasons, it has taken over three years, since the area was originally designated by the Board of Supervisors, to obtain an official redevelopment plan. The proposed amendment with the one-year rule for a conditional use permit would represent an effective step in moving this job generation program to reality."

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon and seconded by Commissioner Porter that both of the draft resolutions which had been placed before the Commission for consideration be adopted.

Salvador Garza objected to having automobile wrecking yards classified as conditional uses. He stated that many of the undesirable conditions presently afflicting automobile wrecking yards are the fault of the City which has been unwilling to improve streets or to provide public utilities service in the areas occupied by automobile wrecking yards. If the City were willing to assume its share of responsibility for improving those conditions, he believed that the members of his profession would be able to improve their circumstances.

President Fleishhacker remarked that the ordinance proposed by the staff of the Department of City Planning would allow wrecking yards which had met the conditions established by the City Planning Commission to remain in operation indefinitely unless a specific time limit had been established as one of the conditions for a particular reason.

Mr. Dorsey noted that contractors' storage warehouses constitute a use similar to automobile wrecking yards; yet, while the City Planning Code provides that such uses must be enclosed, it treats them as principal uses rather than as conditional uses. Under the circumstances, he questioned why the automobile wrecking industry had been "segregated" from other similar uses and given the designation of conditional uses. Although stipulations had previously been set by the Planning Commission for certain automobile

wrecking yards, he was not aware that those stipulations had ever been enforced. Given those circumstances, he did not understand why the staff of the Department of City Planning had suddenly become so interested in automobile wrecking yards or why they were now proposing that each new yard proposed be subject to special review by the City Planning Commission.

Mr. Jacobs remarked that there are significant differences between contractors' storage yards and automobile wrecking yards; and he indicated that the two uses do not have the same character or pose the same problems. He felt that adoption of the proposed ordinance would benefit the automobile wrecking industry by allowing automobile wrecking yards to be located in M-1 districts as conditional uses. As an alternative, the existing ordinance could remain unchanged, and automobile wrecking yards would continue to be allowed only in M-2 districts; however, since plans which had already been approved by the City Planning Commission would result in a substantial reduction of the existing M-2 district, he felt that it would be very difficult for the automobile wreckers to locate new sites if they were to be restricted solely to the M-2 district.

Mr. Dorsey concurred with the Director and expressed his appreciation for the staff's proposal that automobile wrecking yards should be allowed to locate in the M-1 district; however, he felt that automobile wrecking yards should be allowed as principal uses in the M-1 district instead of being allowed only as conditional uses. He then asked if automobile wrecking yards presently located in the Butchertown Redevelopment Project Area would have to file conditional use applications if they have not been dislocated at the end of the two-year period; and, if so, he wondered if the owners of those yards would have to meet all of the guidelines recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Jacobs replied that the owners of those yards would have to apply for conditional use authorization upon the expiration of the two-year period if they wished to remain in operation; however, if it were then apparent that the removal of those yards by the Redevelopment Agency would take place within a short period of time, the Commission could authorize extension of the use for a specific period of time without requiring conformance to the guidelines. In any case he felt that the two-year grace period should not be used to thwart the objectives of the Redevelopment Agency in Butchertown; and, if there were any possibility of that happening, he felt that there was considerable merit in Mr. Herman's request that the grace period should be reduced from two years to one year.

Mr. Dorsey suggested that it would be desirable if all of the regulations of the various City Departments affecting automobile wrecking yards could be consolidated so that members of the industry would know exactly what their responsibilities are. President Fleishhacker replied that the Department of City Planning lacked the ability to coordinate the regulations of other City Departments. However, he felt that the automobile wreckers had made a forward step by forming their own organization; and he suggested that one of the functions of that organization might be to coordinate the various laws and regulations concerning automobile wrecking yards.

Commissioner Kearney, noting that the Redevelopment Agency provides assistance to families which are relocated from redevelopment project areas, asked if similar assistance would be available to the automobile wrecking yards which would have to be relocated from the Butchertown Redevelopment Project Area. Donald Black, representing the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, stated that the agency had worked with the owners of automobile wrecking yards within the Butchertown Redevelopment Area to assist them in the relocation process; and he indicated that the agency would continue its efforts.

Mr. Axelrod remarked that the Redevelopment Agency does not have the same mandatory obligation to assist in relocation of industries as they do with regard to families which are to be relocated; however, he confirmed that the Redevelopment Agency had been most cooperative.

John Jacobs, Executive Director of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, indicated that he supported the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning with regard to the proposed ordinance. He stated, however, that he would not have supported the proposed ordinance if it had been drafted to allow automobile wrecking yards as principal uses in the M-1 district.

After further discussion, the question was called and the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6357 and to approve the amendments to the City Planning Code concerning auto wrecking.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6358 be adopted establishing guidelines to be used by the

[illegible]

Commission for review of conditional use applications for automobile wrecking yards.

At 4:10 p.m. President Fleishhacker announced a five minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 4:15 p.m. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

CU69.14 301 Grafton Avenue, southwest corner of Plymouth Avenue; Request for extension of non-conforming use grocery store from 1970 to May 2, 1980.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had requested permission to continue operation of the subject non-conforming use grocery store until May 2, 1980.

Margaret Perasso, the applicant, informed the Commission that her sole livelihood is derived from the subject grocery store; and it was her feeling that the grocery store is a great convenience for people living in the neighborhood. She submitted a petition which had been signed by residents of the neighborhood urging approval of the subject application.

The Secretary submitted letters which had been received in support of the subject application.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Mr. Steele remarked that the existing grocery store does provide a service for the neighborhood; and he indicated that the store had not resulted in any detrimental effect on nearby dwellings. Therefore, he recommended approval of the application subject to five conditions, one of which required that the exterior appearance of the store should be improved at an early date by painting and by removal of miscellaneous signs. After summarizing the conditions, he submitted a draft resolution to the Commission and recommended its adoption.

Mrs. Perasso stated that she would be willing to conform to the conditions contained in the draft resolution. She indicated that she had not been willing to spend money to have the building painted until it was certain that the store could continue in operation until 1980; however, if the application were approved, she would be willing to have the building painted.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6359 and that the application be approved subject to conditions.

CU69.18 425 Vernon Street, west line, north of Garfield Street; Request for a nursery school, child care center, and community club house in an R-1 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the property is presently occupied by a one-family dwelling with a total floor area of 3,250 square feet including ten rooms and three baths; the building is totally detached with substantial yards. The Ingleside Cultural Arts Association, Inc. had filed the subject application requesting permission to use the existing building for a nursery school, child care center, and community club house. The proposed activities would provide for up to fifty preschool aged children and fifty junior high school age and older children. The use would operate between 6:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., and the number of the staff would vary according to demand.

Irene Wise, President of the Ingleside Cultural Arts Association, Inc., stated that she is presently operating a cultural and educational program in her home which is located on San Jose Avenue; however, she hoped that she would be allowed to move the program to the subject building so that the scope of the program could be expanded. She stated that she offers classes of various kinds including classes in ballet, creative movement, psychology, art, dance, and piano. If the application were approved, the building would be used for classes for preschool children during the day; and older children would attend classes after the public schools have closed for the day. She stated that the proposed use of the building would not create a great deal of noise; and she did not feel that it would create any undue traffic congestion. If the subject application were to be approved, and if licensing could be obtained from the State, she believed that her school would be able to qualify for grants-in-aid.

Frank Weiss, 466 Vernon Street, spoke in opposition to the subject application. He advised the Commission that the applicant had first proposed to use the building only for preschool aged children; but the proposal had recently been expanded to include classes for older students. If classes were to be held for older

students, they would probably drive their own automobiles; and people teaching at the school would bring their automobiles to the neighborhood, also. He informed the Commission that parking spaces are already scarce in the subject neighborhood; and he felt that the added parking congestion which would result from the proposed use of the subject property would be undesirable. In conclusion, he stated that all but five of the people living in the subject block had signed a petition in opposition to the subject application.

President Fleishhacker asked if Mr. Weiss would find the applicant's proposal acceptable if classes were to be limited to pre-school aged children. Mr. Weiss replied in the affirmative.

Mrs. Sims, 422 Ralston Street, stated that she lives directly behind the subject property; and she indicated that she objected strongly to the proposal to hold classes for older children in the building. She stated that she works at night, and she felt that the proposed operation might be quite noisy if classes were scheduled for teenagers. Furthermore, very little parking is available in the subject neighborhood; and, if teenagers were to be attending classes in the subject building, the parking congestion would probably become much worse.

Lucile Foster, 435 Vernon Street, stated that she lives next door to the subject property. She advised the Commission that she would prefer that the subject building not be used for any classes whatsoever. If non-residential use of the property were authorized at the present time, she feared that a more undesirable use might be made of the site at a later date if the school should relocate or cease its operation.

The Director informed Miss Foster that the Commission was not considering changing the zoning of the subject property. The applicant had requested conditional use approval of her proposal to use the existing building as a school; and, if the proposed use were to be discontinued after being approved by the Commission, the building would be returned to residential use.

Ruth Kislingbury, 414 Vernon Street, stated that she lives directly across the street from the subject site. She indicated that she would be willing to support the application if the classes were to be offered only for preschool children; however, she did object to use of the building for classes for teenagers or adults and suggested that such classes should be held elsewhere, perhaps in classrooms

belonging to the Board of Education.

The Director remarked that there may well have been some misunderstandings regarding the size of the operation proposed for the subject property since the applicant had at one time envisioned a much larger institution than the one which had finally been proposed. As a result of its review of the subject application, the staff of the Department of City Planning had determined that the proposed child care and tutoring and education programs for children from the subject residential community would meet a need in that area of the City; and conditions had been formulated which would protect and enhance the amenities of the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, he recommended that the application be approved subject to eight conditions which read as follows:

1. Said authorization shall be for a day nursery for preschool age children and for education programs directed to school age children, primarily residents of the Ingleside, Ingleside Terrace, Merced Heights, Ocean View and San Miguel districts of the City, an area generally bounded by Ocean Avenue, Junipero Serra Boulevard, the San Francisco-San Mateo County line and San Jose Avenue.

2. The number of preschool age children cared for at the day nursery shall not exceed 34 at any one time, and the number of school age children being taught at the subject site shall not exceed 20 at any one time.

3. The nature of the instruction given to the school age children shall not result in excessive or undue noise.

4. The hours of operation of the child care and and educational programs offered at the subject site shall be only between 6:00 A.M. and 9:00 P.M.

5. No exterior alterations shall be made to the existing building that would lessen the basic residential character, and the building and

surrounding yard area shall be maintained in a clean and attractive manner.

6. Signs, if any, shall be limited to one non-illuminated identifying sign, mounted flush on the building, not exceeding a height of 12 feet nor an area of 4 square feet.

7. Two off-street parking spaces, one of which may be tandem, shall be maintained on the subject lot, and the operators of the program offered at the subject site shall be responsible for the prevention of on-street parking violations by persons coming to the subject site.

8. Said authorization is solely for the operation of the activities described in Condition 1 above by the Ingleside Cultural Arts Association, and shall cease upon the vacation of the subject property by that Association.

Commissioner Porter noted that members of the Commission had taken a field trip to the subject site. At that time, the Commission had understood that the building would be used only as a nursery school for preschool aged children; and she felt that such a use of the site would be suitable. However, she did not believe that it would be desirable to use the building for late afternoon or evening classes for school aged children. Therefore, the hours of operation specified in Condition No. 4 of the draft resolution seemed to her to be excessive; and she suggested that the condition should be changed to specify that operation of the proposed facility would be authorized only from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The Director pointed out that parents of some of the children attending the nursery school would have to report to work before 8:00 a.m.; and others would not arrive home from work before 6:00 p.m. Under the circumstances, he felt that the hours suggested by Commissioner Porter for operation of the facility would be too restrictive.

Robert Clark, agent for the applicant, agreed with the Director that authorization for the use only between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. would be too restrictive, particularly since it would always be possible for parents to become bogged down in traffic

during rush hours. He introduced two of Mrs. Wise's teenaged students and emphasized that the classes offered by the institute would be designed for talented students and would not be noisy in nature.

President Fleishhacker pointed out that it would not be possible for the Commission to establish a condition requiring that the school accept only talented students. Mr. Clark acknowledged that fact; however, he assured the Commission that the institute is selective in its choice of students; and he felt that it was important that the school should be able to accept students of all ages.

In response to a request from Commissioner Porter for more informating regarding the program of the institute, Mrs. Wise stated that she tries to provide one teacher for every ten preschool students; and, if the subject application were approved, she estimated that she would have to have at least ten teachers for her daytime classes. Classes for older children were usually limited to five or seven students; and she intended to hire at least three art teachers, two dance teachers, and one psychology teacher to work with the teenagers. She stated that the teenagers attending classes at the school would not drive automobiles; and, in any case, she did not intend to have a large number of children in the house at any one time.

Sheryl Lynch stated that she is the parent of one of the children who has been attending classes at the institute; and she felt that Mrs. Wise is doing an excellent job. She stated that she herself is employed as a teacher. Consequently, she often has to take her child to the nursery school early in the morning; and, sometimes, she is required to remain in meetings until 6:00 p.m. Under the circumstances, she felt that the hours of operation recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning would be appropriate.

Commissioner Wight remarked that the hours of operation would not be so significant if the school were authorized to accept only preschool aged children.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Mellon absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting; Virgil L. Elliot, his alternate, assumed the vacant chair.

Commissioner Porter stated that she appreciated the effort being made by the institute to educate older children; however, she felt that it would be desirable to hold such classes somewhere other than in a residential area.

After further discussion, Commissioner Kearney moved that action

be taken by the Commission in accordance with the Director's recommendation. That motion failed for want of a second.

The Director stated that he would be willing to change Condition No. 4 of the draft resolution to specify that the hours of operation of the proposed facility should be from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. However, before making a decision regarding the hours during which the proposed facility should be allowed to operate, he felt that the Commission should first decide whether the institute should be limited to preschool children or if authorization should also be given for classes for school aged children.

Commissioner Porter stated that she had been impressed by the fact that most of the neighbors had indicated that they would not object to use of the site for a nursery school. Under the circumstances, she felt that it might be desirable for the Commission to take the matter under advisement to allow further opportunity for the applicants and residents of the neighborhood, working with the staff of the Department of City Planning, to resolve their differences.

The Director recommended that the matter be taken under advisement until the Commission's meeting of April 24.

Commissioner Kearney asked Mrs. Wise to consider whether it would be possible to operate her school without a piano or record player since that type of equipment might create undue noise.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the subject application be taken under advisement until the Commission's meeting on April 24, 1969.

CU69.15 Washington Street, south line, 82.5 feet west of Taylor Street; request for automobile parking lot in an R-4 and R-5 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is presently vacant. He stated that the applicant had proposed to use the vacant lot as an automobile parking lot for customers of an adjacent non-conforming use cocktail lounge which has no expiration date. The application had stated that the lot could be used for fourteen cars which would be parked by

an attendant.

Michael Ledgerwood, attorney for the applicant, advised the Commission that the subject vacant lot in its present condition is both a fire and a health hazard. He stated that his clients have a long-term lease on the lot; and, since the present state of the financial market is not conducive to construction of new buildings, he hoped that the subject application would be approved so that the lot could be used for the parking of automobiles. He displayed a plot plan of the proposed parking lot, noting the way in which the lot would be lighted and emphasizing that existing trees would be retained on the site. He remarked that the cocktail lounge presently employs three attendants who take cars belonging to customers to a garage located in a different area; and, therefore the proposed parking lot would not encourage traffic which does not already exist in the area. Under the circumstances, he felt that the principal issue to be decided by the Commission was whether the vacant lot should remain in its present unattractive state or whether it should be developed as a parking lot.

Mr. Ledgerwood indicated that attendants would pick up automobiles belonging to arriving customers at the door of the cocktail lounge and would park the automobiles in the lot; the automobiles would not be parked by the customers themselves. Because of the proximity of the lot to the cocktail lounge, he believed that traffic congestion in the neighborhood would be considerably reduced, particularly since people would no longer have to drive around the block looking for a parking place. He noted that a similar request had been disapproved by the Commission several years ago because residents of the neighborhood had felt that such a use would drastically change the character of the neighborhood; however, he noted that the Commission had approved a conditional use parking lot in a nearby block to serve a small restaurant located at Clay and Jones Streets during the interim since his client's application had been disapproved.

Commissioner Porter stated that members of the Commission had taken a field trip to the subject site and had noticed a great deal of trash on the property. She asked to whom the trash container located on the vacant lot belonged. Mr. Ledgerwood believed that the trash container is used by people who live at 1255 Taylor Street.

A member of the Police Department, speaking as an individual,

felt that approval of the subject application would alleviate parking problems in the subject neighborhood.

Ernest Sutro, 1200 Washington Street, spoke in opposition to the subject application. He believed that the cocktail lounge owned by the applicant would eventually change the character of the subject neighborhood to resemble that of Fillmore Street or Howard Street; and, although he realized that there was no action which he could take to cause removal of the cocktail lounge, he felt that no action should be taken by the Commission which would encourage an expansion of the cocktail lounge's activities. He stated that customers of the bar presently park in front of the driveways in the subject neighborhood; and when they leave the cocktail lounge at 2:00 a.m. they often make a terrible noise. If all of the parked automobiles belonging to customers of the cocktail lounge were to be located on one lot, he felt that the noise which would be made at closing time would be most disturbing. Under such circumstances, he believed that many of his present tenants would move out of his apartment building.

John Griffith, 1302 Taylor Street, indicated that he, also, felt that the proposed parking lot would increase the business of the cocktail lounge; and, in so doing, it would increase the nuisance of having such a use located in a residential district. In conclusion, he remarked that customers leaving the cocktail lounge at 2:00 in the morning are often quite noisy, sometimes shouting and sometimes fighting.

John French, 1302 Taylor Street, felt that the cocktail lounge owned by the applicant is completely out of character with the surrounding residential area which is basically of good quality. He hoped that the subject parcel of property would remain vacant since it is an attractive lot with trees and a blackberry bush which, in its own way, tends to "humanize" the neighborhood. In any case, he felt that the lot would be too small to accommodate fourteen automobiles.

George Williams, a resident of the subject neighborhood for seven years, agreed with other people who had spoken in opposition that authorization of the proposed parking lot would tend to increase the business of the cocktail lounge, making it more of a nuisance for residents of the subject neighborhood. He emphasized that the cocktail lounge is not a neighborhood bar catering to residents of the subject neighborhood; rather, it mostly attracts people living elsewhere who come to the area by automobile.

Beatrice Pon, 1224-48 Washington Street, stated that her property faces the subject building; and she indicated that she has enjoyed the greenery which is growing on the site. She felt that the applicants had deliberately filled the lot with trash to enhance their argument for permission to develop a parking lot on the site. In any case, she thought that use of the subject lot for the parking of automobiles would create a dangerous situation because of the narrowness of Washington Street, the steepness of the hill and because of the cable car traffic in the area.

President Fleishhacker asked if many of the properties along Washington Street have garages. Mrs. Pon replied in the negative.

The Director recommended that the subject application be disapproved. He believed that the proposed parking lot would be incompatible with the surrounding residential uses due to nuisance factors such as the excessive noise which would be created by vehicles and patrons during late evening and early morning hours and because of the additional amount of traffic which would be generated by the proposed use.

Mr. Ledgerwood believed that some of the residents of the subject neighborhood were opposed to the proposed parking lot because it would deprive them of the excessive revenues which they are presently deriving from garage space which they own. With regard to noise, he noted that the cable cars run until at least 12:30 in the morning; and, because of the steepness of the hills in the immediate vicinity of the subject property, the cable cars ring their bells continuously. He denied that approval of the proposed parking lot would increase the business of the cocktail lounge owned by his clients because the cocktail lounge is already filled to capacity. In conclusion, he stated that the subject neighborhood would have a neater appearance and would be much quieter if the proposed parking lot were to be approved.

John Lopes, Jr., the applicant, stated that he had proposed use of the subject lot as a parking lot in an effort to improve traffic and parking congestion in the subject neighborhood; and the project would cost him a great deal of money. However, if residents of the neighborhood did not wish to have the property developed as a parking lot, he would be willing to forget the project.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Wight, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6360 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

At this point in the proceedings, President Fleishhacker absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting. Vice President Kearney assumed the chair.

ZM69.12 420 Bosworth Street, north line, 136.42 feet west of Rousseau Street;
R-1 to a C-M district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property, noting that it constitutes a small portion of a larger lot, sixty percent of which already has a C-M zoning classification. He stated that the irregular zoning boundary, bisecting a lot, had resulted because a new street had been proposed through the subject lot connecting Bosworth Street and San Jose Avenue; and the boundary line between the R-1 and C-M district had been drawn along the center line of the proposed street. He stated that it had been determined that the proposed street would not be built.

Mr. Desai, representing the Ray Oil Burner Company, emphasized that the subject property represents only thirty percent of a larger lot which had already been designated as a C-M zoning district. He stated that his client proposed to construct a new warehouse on the lot; and, if the subject application were not approved to change the present R-1 zoning of the small parcel of property under consideration to C-M, that parcel of property could not be used for the new building. He stated that the new building would be set back from the property lines; and planting would be placed in front of the building.

Mrs. Velma Scripts, President of the Glen Park Property Owners Association, submitted a petition which had been signed by residents of the subject neighborhood in opposition to the proposed rezoning. People living in the adjacent residential area were opposed to any additional industrial zoning in the area because of the detrimental effect which heavy industry could have on the residential neighborhood and because of the number of trucks which such uses bring to the area. She submitted two photographs which she had taken of the existing corrugated steel warehouses used by the Ray Oil Burning Company

and indicated that the very ugliness of such buildings has a detrimental effect on the adjacent residential neighborhood; furthermore, she felt that the large general advertising billboards located on the property owned by the applicant were unsuitable for a residential area. If the subject application were approved, she believed that the remaining residential properties in the block would soon be displaced to accommodate further expansion of the Ray Oil Burner Company. However, she pointed out that the firm's ultimate expansion in the subject block could involve no more than three or four additional lots; and, under the circumstances, she felt that the applicant should seek a new site for his business.

Estelle Mackota, 443 Bosworth Street, represented herself and other adjacent property owners. She advised the Commission that approval of the subject application would result in the construction of a new warehouse immediately adjacent to a house which was recently remodeled; and she felt that such a situation would lower the value of the residential property. She also remarked that truck drivers and employees of the Ray Oil Burner Company litter the area with garbage; and, under the circumstances, she did not think that the subject request for expansion of an industrial use in a residential district should be approved.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application be approved. He remarked that the reason for the earlier alignment of the zoning boundary no longer exists given recent street improvements in the area; and he indicated that approval of the slight expansion of the C-M district as requested would allow enclosure of activities of the Ray Oil Burner Company in a manner compatible with nearby residential properties. He submitted a draft resolution of approval to the Commission for its consideration and recommended its adoption.

Commissioner Elliot asked if the applicants could construct a new building on the seventy percent portion of the subject lot which is already zoned C-M even if the subject application for reclassification of the smaller parcel were not approved. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative; however, the applicants had hoped to make use of the entire lot for their new building.

Mr. Desai reported that the driveway on Bosworth Street would be closed if a new building were constructed; and plantings would be installed to improve the appearance of the property.

Mrs. Scripts asked if the new warehouse would be constructed of corrugated steel. Mr. Desai replied that the building would probably be constructed of corrugated steel or of a similar material.

Mrs. Scripts stated that corrugated steel buildings, besides being unattractive, can be quite noisy if children drag sticks along the sides of the walls.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Elliot, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6361 and that the subject application be approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, April 17, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, April 17, 1969, at 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, President; William M. Brinton, Virgil L. Elliot, Walter S. Newman, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: James S. Kearney, Vice President.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Edward Michael, Planner III; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner.

1:00 p.m. Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m. to take a field trip to properties scheduled for consideration during the Zoning Hearing on May 1, 1969.

2:15 p.m. - Room 282, City Hall

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of March 27, 1969, be approved as submitted.

President Fleishhacker stated that a letter had been received from Edward Lawson, Planner for the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, calling attention to clerical and factual errors which had appeared on pages 11 and 12 of the minutes of the meeting of February 27, 1969. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that corrections be made in the minutes of the meeting of February 27, 1969, as requested by Mr. Lawson.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that he had attended a meeting of the Bayview Hunters Point Model Neighborhood Agency on Wednesday evening. At that time, he presented an oral summary of the South Bayshore Plan and distributed a pre-publication release of selected sections from the text of the report on the proposed Development Plan for the South Bayshore area.

The Director informed the Commission that he and Dean Macris, Assistant Director-Plans & Programs, had attended a meeting at the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association on Monday to describe the work being done by the staff of the Department of City Planning towards preparation of a revised Comprehensive Plan for the City.

The Director reported that the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors, meeting on Tuesday, had held public hearings on the proposed amendments to the City Planning Code concerning car washes and automobile wrecking yards. Both matters were taken under advisement at the end of the meeting.

The Director advised the Commission that the Department of City Planning's proposed budget for the next fiscal year will be reviewed by the Finance Committee next Wednesday night, April 23, at 8:00 p.m.

The Director recommended the adoption of a draft resolution which he had prepared to revise the list of individuals authorized to sign revolving fund checks for the Department of City Planning. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Brinton, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6362.

In response to a request from Commissioner Porter, the Director indicated that he would schedule a meeting with the Advisory Board to the State Office of Planning for the purpose of giving that Board a progress report on the Urban Design Study.

REFERRALS

R67.78 Widening of Alemany Boulevard east of Mission Street overpass.

R68.5 Vacation of Craut Street between Trumbull Street and Alemany Boulevard.

Marie Carlberg, Planner III, stated that the construction of the Southern Freeway and the accompanying relocation of portions of Alemany Boulevard had resulted in occassional oddly-shaped, poorly located surplus parcels which the State Division of Highways is selling at public auctions. At present, there is one such surplus parcel of approximately 15,845 square feet which the State will auction April 22, fronting on Alemany Boulevard just 118 feet east of the Mission Street overpass and directly east of where unimproved Craut Street joins Alemany Boulevard. This R-1 site would be large enough for six houses each with a lot area of 2,500 square feet.

She felt that the best solution to prevent the construction of awkwardly situated and inconveniently located houses would be for the City to acquire and landscape the surplus property; that solution, however, did not appear to be feasible. Yet, in order to protect cars backing into Alemany from the houses to be built on the surplus property, the Department of Public Works had recommended City purchase of a seven-foot strip, 333 feet long, to enable the sidewalk to be set back that distance to provide a parking lane. City purchase of the strip would leave 13,500 square feet in the State surplus parcel, which would allow construction of five houses on the site.

Miss Carlberg stated that the petitioner for the vacation of Craut Street, an easement street, is now the sole abutting owner, having obtained title to a one-foot-wide, 129-foot-long lot on the east side of the street in December, 1967. The petitioner owns a 10,700 square foot lot on the west side of of Craut Street which has its main frontages on Mission and Trumbull Streets but which slopes down to Alemany Boulevard. This lot is zoned C-2 and is vacant except for billboards designed to be seen from Mission Street. The Department of Public Works had proposed a "no parking" restriction on the lots' 67-foot Alemany frontage; but due to the location immediately east of the underpass it would be much more desirable for the City to acquire access rights so that there would be no possibility of ingress and egress of vehicles at this dangerous point even though the frontage is a steep bank. The junction of Craut Street and Alemany Boulevard is not quite as steep -- more buildable, it is important that access should be prohibited here, also. Furthermore, in order to provide more convenient pedestrian access to the potential development on the State surplus property, she felt that all of Craut Street should not be vacated; a twenty-foot strip should be retained to allow for a direct pedestrian route between Trumbull Street and Alemany Boulevard.

The Director recommended that acquistion of a seven-foot strip of property approximately 330 feet long from the State Division of Highways for the widening of Alemany Boulevard be found to be in conformity with the Master Plan. He further recommended that the proposed vacation of Craut Street between Trumbull Street and Alemany Boulevard be found in conformity with the Master Plan providing that the following requirements were met:

1) A 20-foot wide strip shall be retained by the City in Craut Street extending from Trumbull Street to Alemany Boulevard as a pedestrian way serving the potential development on the State surplus property on Alemany Boulevard east of the Mission Street overpass. The petitioner shall construct at his own expense a pedestrian way, including such stairs as may be necessary, 10 feet wide with 5 feet on each side to permit landscaping and a feeling of spaciousness. It would probably be most advantageous to the petitioner for the pedestrian way to be located as far to the east as possible.

2) The City shall retain a 7-foot wide strip of Craut Street adjacent and parallel to Alemany Boulevard for the widening thereof.

3) The petitioner shall dedicate to the City a portion of his one-foot wide Lot 27, Block 5867, 7 feet in depth, adjacent to Alemany Boulevard for the widening thereof.

4) The petitioner shall agree that there will be no access from Alemany Boulevard to Lot 6, Block 5868, and the Board of Supervisors shall designate the 67-foot Alemany Boulevard frontage of Lot 6 for "no parking or stopping at any time."

T. J. Guntien, the petitioner, felt that retention by the City of a twenty-foot wide strip in Craut Street might make it difficult for him to develop the site with a convalescent hospital; however, he indicated that he could not be certain that he would be successful in his bid to acquire the surplus property from the State.

The Director remarked that the project proposed by the petitioner would depend upon many actions being taken by various City and State agencies; and, if the City-owned portion of Craut Street should prove to be a stumbling block after all other necessary approvals have been obtained for the project, another petition could be filed with the City requesting the vacation of the 25-foot portion of Craut Street.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that City acquisition of a seven-foot strip of property approximately 330 feet long from the State Division of Highways on the south side of Alemany Boulevard east of the Mission Street overpass, for the widening of Alemany Boulevard, is in conformity with the Master Plan. It was further recommended that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed vacation of Craut Street between Trumbull Street and Alemany Boulevard is in conformity with the Master Plan provided that the requirements previously recommended by the Director of Planning are met.

R69.16 North Point Street, change of official sidewalk width: North side between Columbus Avenue and the Embarcadero from zero feet to 9 feet; south side between Columbus Avenue and Mason Street from zero feet to 9 feet; south side between Mason Street and the Embarcadero from 10 feet to 9 feet.

The Director recommended that consideration of this matter be postponed indefinitely. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Elliot, and carried unanimously that hearing of the subject referral be postponed indefinitely.

3:00 p.m. - Room 282, City Hall

PRESENTATION OF STAFF REPORT ON THE NORTHERN WATERFRONT PLAN

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, and R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, presented the staff's evaluation of comments which had been received from the public concerning the plan and reported orally on their own evaluation of the plan. The oral report will be available in written form on or before May 29.

President Fleishhacker remarked on the essential importance of the maritime industry to the economic welfare of San Francisco and noted that one of the original purposes of the Northern Waterfront Study had had been to develop a plan which would assure the continued economic viability of the Port. With that objective in mind, he asked the Director if he was confident, based on information presently available to him, that the policies and standards of the proposed plan would allow the Port to derive sufficient funds from rental of its properties not devoted to maritime use to enable it to continue to operate efficiently and economically.

The Director, in response, indicated that it was his opinion that those objectives could be achieved through the proposed plan. However, should specific instances arise in the future where strong cases could be made for the changing of the policies presently being recommended, both the staff of the Department of City Planning and the City Planning Commission would certainly want to reconsider their position. He noted that many similar issues of varying degrees of importance are considered by the City Planning Commission at each of its monthly zoning hearings; but he also stressed that when such issues are considered, the Commission has always concerned itself with a wide range of questions including, but not limited to, economic viability. The principal concern and objective of the City Planning Commission is to coordinate and enhance the overall development of the City; and, in that regard, he felt that the overall policies contained in the proposed plan were of overriding importance. In order to implement those policies, however, he acknowledged that the Commission would have to maintain a great deal of flexibility.

After further discussion, the Director submitted a draft resolution which he had prepared with the following resolves:

"1. That the City Planning Commission hereby declares its intention to hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 19, 1969, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 282, to consider proposed amendments to the Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco, setting forth the policies and proposals applicable to the Northern Waterfront Area, as presented to the City Planning Commission at its regular meeting on April 17, 1969.

2. That this Commission directs its staff to give notice of the said public hearing as required by the Charter, and in any other appropriate manner."

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6363.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, April 24, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, April 24, 1969, at 2:30 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; William M. Brinton, Thomas Miller, and Walter S. Newman, members of the City Planning Commission

ABSENT: James K. Carr and Mrs. Charles B. Porter

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Daniel Sullivan, Planner II; and R. Bruce Anderson, Acting Secretary.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported on yesterday afternoon's meeting of the Urban Design Citizens Advisory Committee. He stated that the Citizens Advisory Committee broke into two groups, one to consider major elements of reconstruction if the City should be leveled by an earthquake, and another to consider major changes should Howard Hughes buy the City. Mr. Jacobs then asked Walter Newman, a member of the Committee, to comment on yesterday's exercise. Mr. Newman stated that Charles Bassett chaired the Hughes group, and that Henrick Bull chaired the earthquake group. Mr. Newman suggested that the recommendations of each group, if susceptible to quick programming, perhaps could be placed into a computer and the results analyzed, resulting in an excellent comparative exercise.

Mr. Jacobs informed the Commission that Jean Jelincich would be back in his office shortly. He was happy to report that Mrs. Jelincich is making an excellent recovery.

The Director noted that he and Commissioners Brinton and Newman had appeared last night before the Finance Committee of the Board for review of the Department's proposed budget for fiscal year 1969-70. He stated that specific requests for equipment and the Planner III position for liaison work in Chinatown came under attack. His overall impression of the Board preserving the Department's "bare bones" budget was not as optimistic as it had once been.

The Director then advised the Commission that this year's edition of the Department's annual Housing Inventory report would be ready for distribution in late May. Furthermore, he stated that this year's report is coming out about one month late, due primarily to some technical problems at the electronic data processing center in City Hall.

Mr. Jacobs acknowledged receipt of a copy of the letter sent to Commissioner Brinton, in which a private individual expressed criticism of a staff member's recent appearance in the South of Market area. The Director informed the Commission that he was in the process of checking out details as to what occurred at this meeting. He also stated that often times people have been brought into meetings in this area under false pretenses.

President Fleishhacker then reported on follow-up to the Commission's meeting last week, which dealt primarily with the staff report on the Northern Waterfront Study and Plan. Mr. Fleishhacker wrote to Cyril Magnin, President of the Port Commission, and asked if the Northern Waterfront Plan, as now constituted, would provide the Port with sufficient revenue-producing capacity for the future. At this point, Mr. Jacobs commented that to the best of his knowledge the Plan would provide the Port with revenue-producing capacity sufficient to meet its obligations. He also stated that following presentation of the staff report at the last Commission meeting, the Department has received many comments showing favorable response to the content and the direction of the Plan. Mr. Jacobs also stated that he believes the Commission is making real headway in achieving comprehensive-type changes. President Fleishhacker remarked that the Commission is concerned with vital economic issues as well as other factors affecting the City's growth and development, and that in the particular case of the Northern Waterfront Plan, a basic reason for doing the Plan is the Port's economic future. Mr. Jacobs confirmed this point by saying that planning for the Northern Waterfront has always proceeded along these lines, with both consultants in total accord on this point.

Commissioner Newman then inquired about the status of North Waterfront Associates and their proposed $100 million development at the foot of Telegraph Hill. Mr. Jacobs responded that the large complex, as originally conceived, probably would go as planned, except that it would proceed on an ad hoc basis. He also stated that both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors had labored hard on making this development happen. Commissioner Brinton added that he had heard that the North Waterfront Associates recently had engaged in refinancing of their property and development.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Brinton dismissed himself because of pressing business matters back at his office.

3:00 p.m. - Room 282, City Hall

CU69.18 - 425 Vernon Street, west line, north of Garfield Street.

Request for a nursery school, child care center, and community club house in an R-1 district.
(Under Advisement from meeting of April 3, 1969.)

President Fleishhacker called the Commission meeting back to order to hear the item scheduled for the 3:00 p.m. calendar. He explained that this item had been postponed from the meeting of April 3 in order to allow the "pro" and "con" sides to get together on this issue. Mr. Fleishhacker then asked Mr. Jacobs to explain the case as it now stands.

The Director reported that there was agreement as to the location of the preschool facility in this neighborhood. However, he reported there was disagreement on the hours of operation for such a facility, and considerable disagreement as to the allowable age group for youngsters attending such a facility. He also reported that the staff of the Department has met with both the proponents of this project and residents living in the neighborhood. Out of all of this, Mr. Jacobs stated that agreement evidently has not been reached; also, as a result of discussions held in this interim, the staff recommendations are not quite the same as at the last meeting.

Mr. Jacobs then suggested that the Commission could do one of two things in proceeding with this case: one, it could hear the case from the beginning, then hear "pro" and "con" arguments and finally the staff recommendations; or two, the staff could make its recommendations, to be followed by "pro" and "con" arguments. Since the case has been heard before as to substance of the proposal, President Fleishhacker suggested that the Commission proceed with the second approach.

Mr. Jacobs then read the draft resolution which contains in considerable specificity the recommendations of the staff:

"WHEREAS, There is a need for day-nursery school facilities in this predominently low-density residential community comprised of the Ingleside, Ingleside Terrace, Merced Heights, Ocean View and San Miguel districts of the City to provide a needed and desirable service to the residents of this area, particularly mothers employed outside of the home;

"WHEREAS, There is also a need for space to provide cultural enrichment and tutoring to school-age children living in this area of the City;

"WHEREAS, The care of preschool-age children and the cultural enrichment and education of school-age persons

[illegible]

from this residential community in the subject building, which is larger than average in floor space and is surrounded by substantial yard areas, would be compatible with the surrounding single-family dwellings so long as the activities at the site do not cause undue noise, do not attract people from outside this residential community, do not result in a substantial number of persons arriving at the site by automobile, or do not result in late evening hours of operation;

"WHEREAS, The imposition of appropriate conditions regulating the permitted activities of, and number of children and others served by a Conditional Use school at the subject site can protect and enhance the existing amenities found in this residential community;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission finds that the conditions set forth in Section 304(c) of the City Planning Code are met and said Conditional Use is hereby AUTHORIZED in accordance with standards specified in the City Planning Code and subject to further conditions as follows:

"1. Said authorization shall be for a day nursery for preschool-age children and for education and cultural enrichment programs directed to elementary and high school-age children, primarily residents of the Ingleside, Ingleside Terrace, Merced Heights, Ocean View and San Miguel districts of the City, an area generally bounded by Ocean Avenue, Junipero Serra Boulevard, the San Francisco-San Mateo County Line and San Jose Avenue.

"2. The number of preschool-age children cared for at the day nursery shall not exceed 34 at any one time, and the number of school-age children being taught at the subject site shall not exceed 20 for the entire school day and 10 at any one time.

"3. The nature of the instruction given to the school-age children shall not result in excessive or undue noise.

"4. The hours of operation of the child care and educational programs offered at the subject site shall be only between 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

"5. No exterior alterations shall be made to the existing building that would lessen the basic residential character, and the building and surrounding yard area shall be maintained in a clean and attractive manner.

"6. Signs, if any, shall be limited to one nonilluminated identifying sign, mounted flush on the building, not exceeding a height of 12 feet nor an area of 4 square feet.

"7. Two off-street parking spaces, one of which may be tandem, shall be maintained on the subject lot, and the operators of the program offered at the subject site shall be responsible for the prevention of on-street parking violations by persons coming to the subject site.

"8. Said authorization is solely for the operation of the activities described in Condition 1 above by the Ingleside Cultural Arts Association, and shall cease upon the vacation of the subject property by that Association."

The Director then mentioned two things obviously quite important in this draft resolution. First, the resolution addresses itself to the age level of young people who would use the school and cultural arts facilities; and second, the resolution takes into account the anticipated traffic conditions created by the construction of the proposed center. Mr. Jacobs then went on to make some general comments pertaining to staff examination as to the suitability of this type of facility for a residential neighborhood. The staff, Mr. Jacobs said, feels that the location is acceptable. The questions of noise and traffic generation are difficult to measure, let alone to anticipate. However, most importantly, the neighborhood is involved, and the meeting today shows that. The staff therefore feels that enforcement is the key issue. If the neighbors should have a complaint once the center is established, the neighbors should direct the complaint to the center. If such a complaint were not to be resolved at the initial source, then the neighbors should come back to the Commission. If the Commission felt the complaint required some form of

administrative or legal remedy, it would then take an appropriate action. In summary, Mr. Jacobs made the following points: There is no question that traffic would be added to the streets if the center is constructed, but it most probably would be marginal at that; the size of the group using this facility should be kept small to minimize the numbers of persons coming and going; the hours of operation at the Cultural Arts Association should be built around pickup and delivery of children as part of normal peak hour traffic movement; and finally, he stated that this is something we should try, to see if it will work out.

President Fleishhacker asked the applicant in this case to respond to the draft resolution.

Irene Wise stepped forward and presented many letters to the Secretary in support of the project proposal. She stated that she agreed to the conditions as set forth in the staff resolution; she feels the center can be run on this basis. She further stated that classes would be held inside the building. President Fleishhacker then asked if the maximum number of pupils to use this facility would be 44. Mr. Jacobs responded in the affirmative. Mrs. Wise went on to state that preschool and school-age classes would not be operated coincidentally, but rather would be operated separately from one another. President Fleishhacker then asked about provisions to control noise at this facility. Mrs. Wise responded that noise would be like that found in one's home; for example, if a phonograph is playing it need not be turned up high. The noise would be just like family noise. President Fleishhacker then asked if it would be like large family noise. Mrs. Wise agreed that it might be like large family noise.

Anne Jayne, a neighbor, rose to speak much in favor of the proposal. She stated that a child care center is needed in the neighborhood and that as a volunteer for the Oceanview-Merced Heights-Ingleside (OMI) Association, a small survey was carried out. She stated that the results of this survey showed that over two hundred parents need this kind of child care service. Many parents feel that reading scores of the children need to be improved. She also stated that the existing house to be used for this facility is larger than others presently on the street, and that students and strangers already are in the area. She feels that the neighborhood and society at large should support this effort by the Ingleside Cultural Arts Association.

Bob McMahon, a member of the OMI board, stated that he has observed the proposed facility with Mrs. Wise. He feels that there is an obligation to provide this opportunity; the need clearly is present. Furthermore, Mr. McMahon felt that other possible uses allowable in this neighborhood could be more injurious than the facility presently proposed.

Charles Cogger, also a member of OMI, added his firm support to the center. He felt that because of the existing structure, anything put into it

administrators of local memory, it would then take up [illegible] matters. In summary, Dr. [illegible] made the following points: There is no question that practice would be added to the program if the [illegible] [illegible] most probably would be maintained [illegible], the size of the present [illegible] facility should be kept small to stimulate the interest of persons using the [illegible]; the hours of operation at the [illegible] should be [illegible] around picnic and [illegible] of normal [illegible] anyone; and finally, [illegible] is something we should try, to see if it will work out.

President Plaindocker takes the applicant in this case as unusual to the Administration.

Lucia [illegible] stated [illegible] and requested [illegible] in the [illegible] in support of this [illegible] proposal. She stated that [illegible] [illegible] resolutions [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] stated that [illegible] [illegible]. President Plaindocker then asked if the [illegible] this facility would be [illegible]. Mrs. Jacobs responded in the [illegible] [illegible] specifically [illegible] operated separately [illegible]. [illegible] facility. [illegible], for example, [illegible] it need not be limited [illegible]. President Plaindocker then asked [illegible] like large family [illegible].

[illegible], a [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible]. He stated that a [illegible] is the [illegible] as a volunteer for the [illegible], a public survey was carried out. The results of this survey [illegible] that [illegible]. [illegible] the [illegible] and that [illegible] at large should [illegible] effort by the [illegible].

[illegible], a [illegible] the proposed facility [illegible]. [illegible] there is [illegible] facility [illegible] program.

Charles [illegible], [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible], [illegible] to

would require some kind of variance. This use would minimize disruption of the existing neighborhood, and therefore should be approved.

Mrs. Jackson, who works in the Western Addition as a youth counselor, stated her support of the center as a parent with a child in the program.

Miss Gale Wise stated that she is a member of the Ingleside Cultural Arts Association. She told the Commission that the group does not wish to throw bricks to get something done; rather, they wish to do things constructively and that is why they are asking for this facility.

Sister Joan Bosco advised the Commission that she has talked with Mrs. Wise, in addition to having taught two of Mrs. Wise's children. Sister Bosco told the Commission that she agrees with Mrs. Wise's educational goals and cultural objectives, and that she agrees with Mr. Jacob's statement as to the need for preschool educational facilities.

Miss Katie Wilson, present owner of the house in which the Ingleside Cultural Arts Association wishes to locate, stated that she wants the Association to have this house; she feels that it would be a definite asset to the neighborhood to have this school as part of it.

Jim Hinzdel said he thought that the center would take the place of home education for many children whose parents work, and in this light it would be a good thing for the community.

The last proponent to be heard was Billy Ellis, Jr. who recited a poem entitled, "I Dream A World".

President Fleishhacker then stated that the Commission would like to hear from the opposition, but in following Mr. Ellis' recitation, felt that the opposition had a tough act to follow. He asked for comments not in opposition to the educational program, but as to use of this facility in the neighborhood.

Felton Miles, 454 Vernon Street and a neighbor on the block, told the Commission that he was not in opposition to the program but said he feels that the program is too big for the house. He felt it definitely would add to parking problems in the area, and that traffic conditions would worsen. Also, the program might drive out certain families now living in the neighborhood. Mr. Miles went on to say that preschool-age programs would be okay, but that high school programs would not. He mentioned of hearing that a college-age program is in the mill, and that the Association might use this house seven days a week. Mr. Jacobs asked Mrs. Wise to respond to these points. Mrs. Wise stated that no classes would be held on Sundays, and that classes at the high school level would be held only on Saturdays.

Arlesse Miles, of 454 Vernon, told the Commission she feels that it is going to be a segregated thing, and that the neighborhood does not need that because too much of that exists already. She also stated that as a tax payer, she does not want this kind of thing shoved down her throat. If the facility is to go in, Mrs. Miles feels that the neighborhood will have to concern itself about litter, cars in driveways, and child indoctrination.

Frank Wise, a resident of the area, reported that he circulated a petition to 29 homes on the block. The results of this petition showed that 25 homes signed in opposition to anything of a level higher than preschool and kindergarten programs. He also felt that traffic will be a major problem and that pickup and delivery of children will present problems. In his experience as a resident of the area, the Fire Department has enough problems as it is with parked cars. In summary, he felt that people on the block would accept preschool-age programs only.

Hearing no more views from the opposition, President Fleishhacker asked for views from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Kearney made two points: first, he did not feel that ten kids, at the high school level, would be of the type to sacrifice their free time unless they seriously are undertaking a program directly tied in to the interests and objectives of this Association; and second, Mr. Kearney stated that he would move for adoption of this resolution, with strict adherence to conditions as stated in the draft resolution.

Commissioner Newman seconded Mr. Kearney's motion. The vote of the Commission, when called for by President Fleishhacker, was 4 - 0 in favor of the draft resolution.

President Fleishhacker asked Mrs. Wise for full cooperation with this experimental program. Mrs. Wise rose to state that she intends to cooperate to the fullest extent possible.

With no further business to consider, President Fleishhacker adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Bruce Anderson
Acting Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, May 1, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, May 1, 1969, at 2:15 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: James S. Kearney, Vice President; William M. Brinton, James J. Finn, Thomas G. Miller, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, President.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Daniel Sullivan, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle; and Bill Dorais represented Television Station KQED.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that he had appeared in Court earlier in the day to offer testimony with regard to a suit which had been brought against the Redevelopment Agency relating to the Yerba Buena Center project.

Commissioner Porter and the Secretary reported on their recent attendance at the annual conference of the American Society of Planning Officials in Cincinnati.

2:30 p.m. - Zoning Hearing

CU69.19 318 Taraval Street, north side, 70 feet west of Funston Avenue
To permit a veterinarian hospital and clinic on the ground floor of building.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had requested permission to use the subject vacant retail store located in a C-2 district as a veterinary hospital and clinic. He noted that the Commission, in authorizing conditional use animal hospitals on previous occasions, had made the authorizations subject to explicit sound and odor controls to ameliorate the nuisance aspects associated with such hospitals; and the applicant had indicated that he would be willing to comply with the type of conditions which had been established previously.

Merton J. Silver, the applicant, summarized his educational and professional background. He stated that the proposed facility would be operated as an outpatient clinic containing only four or six kennels and having no outdoor runs; and the building would be renovated especially for the new use by an architect. Mr. Silver believed that there is a definite need for the new veterinary hospital in the subject neighborhood, the nearest facility of the same type being located almost two miles away. In addition, more than one hundred people had signed a petition which he had circulated testifying to the need for the facility. Mr. Silver advised the Commission that a survey had been taken of 56 blocks of the City which had indicated that each block contains four to six animals; and, as a result, he estimated that approximately four thousand animals are housed in the one-thousand-block area surrounding the subject site. Since a veterinary practice can be considered successful if it serves as few as two thousand animals, he felt that it was obvious that the hospital proposed is needed.

Mr. Silver stated that he had talked with adjacent property owners and had assured them that adequate soundproofing would be installed in the proposed hospital. He had also advised them that animals would not be kept overnight in the hospital except in emergency situations since all major operations would be conducted in other pet hospitals. He stated that there are 21 off-street parking spaces located in the subject block; and he had never found all of those spaces to be in use at any one time. Under the circumstances, he did not feel that approval of the proposed hospital would cause parking problems in the subject neighborhood. Furthermore, because his appointments would be staggered at fifteen minute intervals, he doubted that the clinic would significantly increase traffic congestion in the area. In conclusion, Mr. Silver stated that he was cognizant of the various code requirements relating to pet hospitals; and he indicated that he would be willing to conform to those requirements.

Nicholas S. Beyer, 2379 Funston Avenue, stated that his property abuts the subject site. He submitted a petition which had been signed by 76 people living in the immediate vicinity who opposed the subject application. He believed that approval of the pet hospital would downgrade the adjacent R-1 neighborhood, bringing economic hardship and unhappiness to residents of the area. In addition, the tax revenues of the City would be lowered because of the damaging affect which the proposed facility would have on adjacent residential properties. Mr. Beyer disagreed with Mr. Silver that additional pet hospitals are needed in the subject area and pointed out that pet hospitals are already in operation on Irving Street and at another location on Taraval Street.

Mr. Beyer stated that he and other residents of the neighborhood had observed other pet hospitals in operation; and, as a result, they had learned that it is impossible to eliminate either noise or odors completely. They had also noted that animals entering or leaving the pet hospital often create messes on the sidewalk; and such a situation would be undesirable in the subject neighborhood since many school children walk to and from classes along the Taraval Street sidewalk. Mr. Beyer stated that both parking and traffic congestion pose serious problems in the subject neighborhood; and those problems would be complicated by the proposed pet hospital, especially since people arriving with sick pets have a

tendency to double park in front of pet hospitals. He stated that he had been advised by the owner of an apartment house which is located near to another pet hospital that the proximity of such a facility makes it difficult for him to rent his apartments. He himself would not consider renting or buying property in an area where such a facility was located; however, since he already owns property in the subject neighborhood, he hoped that the Commission would disapprove the application which was presently being considered.

Joseph Driscoll, owner of property at 330 Taraval Street, stated that his building contains six apartment units; and he felt that the proposed pet hospital would disturb his tenants because of the noise and other problems which it would create and because it would add to parking congestion in the neighborhood.

J. B. Barreneche, 324 Taraval Street, advised the Commission that he was very much opposed to the proposed pet hospital. He stated that he has children who play in the subject neighborhood; and he felt that the additional traffic congestion which would be created by the proposed use would endanger his children. Furthermore, he felt that it would not be desirable to have his children running through any messes which might accumulate on the sidewalk in front of the proposed pet hospital.

Carroll Morris, 2339 - 37th Avenue, spoke for the Portola Church and indicated that the congregation of the church was of the opinion that the proposed pet hospital would not be a desirable neighbor.

Lewis Fortin, 2357 Funston Avenue, stated that his backyard is located only 150 feet distant from the backyard of the proposed pet hospital; and he also advised the Commission that he owns two rental properties which are located only 75 feet away from the subject site. Even if the applicants were to wash down the sidewalks in front of the proposed pet hospital, the material would probably be deposited in the gutter in front of his property because of the slope of the hill; and, in any case, he believed that a great deal of odor from the pet hospital would be carried to his properties because of the prevailing direction of the wind. Under the circumstances, he indicated that he was very much opposed to the subject application. In conclusion, he asked the members of the audience who were present in opposition to the subject application to rise; and a large number of people responded.

John Wiese, 2378 Funston Avenue, stated that the reasons for his opposition to the proposed pet hospital had been summed up well by previous speakers. In addition, he noted that there had been much debate recently about the decline and deterioration of the City; and, in an effort to overcome those problems, he felt that a general policy should be established aimed at the conservation of residential neighborhoods. In San Francisco, he felt that a negative decision by the City Planning Commission on the subject application should be taken as the first step towards the establishment of such a policy.

[illegible]

Earl Nevers, 2383 Funston Avenue, agreed with other individuals who had spoken in opposition to the subject application. He also pointed out that the four houses located on the corner of Taraval Street and Funston Avenue had been built on seventy-foot lots, all of the houses having rear yards with a depth of only twenty feet which abut the site of the proposed veterinary hospital.

Bud Retzloff, 335 Taraval Street, stated that he is a Realtor with offices in the subject neighborhood. He indicated that he had previously maintained an office opposite the Taraval Pet Hospital; and, even though that facility was well-designed, odor problems, traffic problems, and messes on the sidewalk had developed. That particular facility had depreciated the value of other properties in the area; and it had become difficult for property owners to find tenants for their buildings. He believed that the proposed facility would have an equally detrimental affect on the subject neighborhood; and for that reason he was opposed to the subject application. In any case, he did not believe that the proposed facility would be needed since other pet hospitals are already located in the Sunset District.

John Kennedy, 2364 - 14th Avenue, joined with Mr. Retzloff in questioning the need for the proposed facility. He pointed out that the yellow pages of the telephone directory list sixteen pet hospitals in San Francisco, five of which are located between Irving and Taraval Streets. Having concluded his remarks, he asked if all pet hospitals are subject to the same code requirements.

Mr. Passmore stated that pet hospitals established prior to 1960 were not subject to any special requirements whatsoever; however, since the adoption of the new zoning ordinance, pet hospitals located in C-2 districts have had to be authorized as conditional uses by the Commission; and, in approving such applications, the Commission had customarily required that specific conditions, including sound control, be met.

Mr. Kennedy noted that plans for the Western Freeway had been scrapped because of the prime residential character of the subject neighborhood; and he did not feel that the character of the neighborhood would be enhanced if the subject application were approved.

The Director recommended that the subject application be disapproved. He stated that the applicant had not demonstrated the need or the desirability of the proposed facility at the subject site; and, since the site is surrounded by residentially used property, the potential for sound or odor problems being created by the proposed pet hospital would render the use undesirable in the subject neighborhood.

Mr. Silver indicated that he did not wish to make any comments in rebuttal to the Director's recommendation.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6365 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

CU69.20 St. Ignatius High School site, north portion of block bounded by Stanyan, Turk, Parker and McAllister Streets
Expansion of University of San Francisco Campus in R-3 districts; building to be converted to classrooms, offices, and parking lot.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the University proposed to use the existing high school building as a classroom and administration building for the University. The playfield would be retained, but the area to the north of the playfield would be combined with paved areas on either side of the building for a parking lot accommodating a total of approximately 190 cars; and those 190 parking spaces would fulfill a requirement established in 1967 when the Commission had given conditional use authorization for construction of a new nursing building on the main campus of the University. The University had indicated that the present proposal would not result in any increase in the enrollment of the University.

Timothy L. McDonnell, special assistant to the president of the University of San Francisco, advised the Commission that a letter had been sent to all residents of the subject neighborhood to explain how the St. Ignatius site would be used by the University. He noted that the University has been coeducational since 1964; and, although women now comprise more than one-half of the student body, no gymnasium building had yet been constructed for their use. Therefore, the University intended to use the gymnasium facilities of the St. Ignatius site for its women students. The classrooms in the existing building would be used for physical education courses during the daytime hours. In view of the uses proposed, he doubted that more than five hundred people would be on the high school site during the day.

Most of the people attending classes or using the facilities on the high school site would arrive by way of Parker Avenue; and a bridge would be constructed from the new parking lot to the second floor of the classroom building to accommodate those students who would be entering the parking lot from Turk Street. A new turf track would be installed in the playing field, thus eliminating the dust problem which has troubled residents of the neighborhood in the past; and the perimeters of the parking area would be extensively landscaped.

Father McDonnell also advised the Commission that the classrooms on the high school site would be used for three shifts of evening classes beginning at 5:00 p.m. The evening classes would be attended primarily by older people. The average class would have approximately twenty students; and the maximum number of classes which could be held during any single shift would be 25. He expected that roughly five hundred people would be attending classes during the first two

shifts, in addition to the 25 instructors and staff people who would be on the site. During the last shift, he estimated that only two hundred students would be attending classes in the building.

Father McDonnell stated that the University had originally proposed to provide 114 parking spaces on the subject site; however, following lengthy discussions with the staff of the Department of City Planning, the plans had been changed to provide for 190 parking spaces. In addition to the new parking spaces which would be created, on-street parking spaces around the perimeter of the site would now be available to University students, giving a total of approximately 450 parking spaces to serve the new campus. Particularly in view of the fact that St. Ignatius students would no longer be parking in the area, he felt that the parking situation in the subject neighborhood should be better than it ever has been.

In conclusion, Father McDonnell stated that the University did not consider the present proposal to be permanent in nature since the St. Ignatius High School building is forty years old; however, the site would be used as proposed until such time as new facilities, including an underground parking garage, have been constructed on the University's main campus. During the interim, the enrollment of the University would not be increased. The reasons for that decision were internal to the University in nature but included such considerations as the limited availability of good teachers and the desirability of obtaining a balanced mixture of men and women students.

Commissioner Porter asked if the use of the St. Ignatius High School site being proposed would be in substantial conformity with the University's master plan which had been approved by the City Planning Commission two years ago. Father McDonnell replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Porter then asked when the St. Ignatius site would become available to the University. Father McDonnell replied that the High School plans to vacate the buildings during the last week of August.

Mrs. Charles S. Fortune, 241 Stanyan Street, stated that it is absolutely impossible for visitors to park within several blocks of the campus at the present time; and it seemed to her that the scheduling of night classes on the St. Ignatius site would create an even greater parking problem in the subject neighborhood. Under the circumstances, she felt that the amount of parking space to be provided on the St. Ignatius site should be expanded.

John Pflueger, representing the firm of Milton T. Pflueger and Associates, Architects for the applicants, emphasized that the parking being provided would be sufficient to meet the requirements which had previously been established by the City Planning Commission.

Commissioner Porter noted that parking is a major problem with most large universities; however, she pointed out that the Commission had made every effort to improve the parking situation in the vicinity of the University of San Francisco two years ago. She asked if Mr. Pflueger felt that the parking

situation in the subject neighborhood would be improved if the subject application were to be approved. Mr. Pflueger replied in the affirmative, emphasizing that one thousand high school students would be leaving the area and that the University of San Francisco did not intend to increase its enrollment. As a result, fewer students would be in the area; and more parking spaces would be available.

Mitchell E. Cutler, 2942 Turk Street, addressed the Commission as president of the San Francisco Heights Civic Club. He stated that the letter to residents of the area referred to by Father McDonnell had not been mailed until April 28; and, in spite of the fact that residents of the neighborhood were vitally interested in the project, they had not had sufficient time to familiarize themselves with the details of the University's plan. He stated that he had visited the offices of the Department of City Planning on the previous day to review the plans which were then available; however, the plans which he had seen had not shown the ramp which was proposed from the parking lot to the second floor of the classroom building. Furthermore, no landscaping plans were available. He emphasized that landscaping of the proposed parking lot would be extremely important from the point of view of residents of the neighborhood; and he felt that action by the Commission on the subject application should be delayed until he and other residents of the neighborhood have had an opportunity to inspect more detailed plans for the project. He doubted that sufficient provision had been made for easy access to or egress from the proposed parking lot; and he felt that that feature of the plan should be subject to further investigation, also. In conclusion, Mr. Cutler asked what assurance could be given that a high-rise building would not be built on the subject property at a later date.

Commissioner Porter stated that the application presently being considered by the Commission did not involve the construction of any new buildings on the site; and, if plans were to be developed for construction of a high-rise building on the campus at a later date, that proposal would have to be reviewed by the Commission as the subject of a separate conditional use application.

Mr. Cutler asked if landscaping would be installed along the Turk Street frontage of the subject site and if more than one entrance and exit would be provided to the parking area. Mr. Passmore replied that plans which had been submitted indicated that landscaping would be installed only along Parker Avenue and on the playing field itself. Two exits would be provided from the parking lot onto Turk Street.

Mr. Cutler stated that he was of the opinion that entrances to the parking lot should be provided from Parker Avenue.

Mr. Pflueger stated that while the plans had not indicated landscaping along Turk and Stanyan Streets, the University would be willing to install such landscaping; and, in fact, he understood that that would be one of the conditions established by the Commission if the subject application were to be approved.

The Secretary submitted several letters which had been received commenting on the congested parking situation in the subject neighborhood and suggesting that more parking space should be provided on the St. Ignatius site.

The Director recommended approval of the expansion of the University of San Francisco to the St. Ignatius High School site and utilization of the buildings on that site by the University of San Francisco in order to lessen the crowding of the present facilities on the main campus. He stated that the 190 parking spaces which would be provided by the expanded campus site would significantly aid in alleviating the parking congestion that now exists in the area, especially since the University had indicated that it would not increase student enrollment. He noted that the site expansion had been contemplated in the Master Plan for the University which had been reviewed by the Commission in 1967. After distributing a draft resolution of approval for consideration by the Commission, he read and commented upon the five conditions which it contained, calling specific attention to Condition No. 2 which provided, in part, that, "All parking areas shall be screened from facing residential properties by a solid fence, wall or solid landscaping screen, and said landscaping plans shall include appropriate on-site shrubs, ground cover, and trees to enhance the appearance of the parking area as viewed from nearby residential properties. All three street frontages of the site shall be planted with appropriate street trees."

Mr. Cutler stated that screening of the parking area by construction of a solid fence would not be satisfactory unless the fence were to be landscaped.

Commissioner Porter suggested that Condition No. 2 of the draft resolution should be reworded to provide that all parking areas should be screened from residential properties "by a landscaped solid fence, wall or solid landscaping screen . . . ".

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be amended as suggested by Commissioner Porter and that it be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6366. The application was thereby approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution as modified.

CU69.21 2744 Sacramento Street, north side, 137.5 feet west of Pierce Street
To permit construction of a 90-bed convalescent hospital.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. The applicant proposed to construct a ninety-bed convalescent hospital on the subject site in an R-4 district. The hospital would have a ground floor with lobby and garage for fifteen automobiles, a service floor, and three nursing floors, rising to a height of 56 feet above Sacramento Street. Each nursing floor would have thirty beds, with 24 beds in eight rooms, facing on light-courts, 25 feet long and eight feet wide.

Mr. Passmore stated that a convalescent hospital for more than six patients may be authorized by conditional use in an R-4 district. Such a hospital would not have to conform to the lot coverage (75 percent) and rear yard (twenty feet) requirements for dwellings in R-4 districts. However, those requirements could be imposed by the Commission as conditions in approving a conditional use. The Code requirement for hospitals is one parking space for each eight beds; however, that minimum requirement could be modified by the Commission. In prior conditional use convalescent convalescent hospital authorizations, the Commission had required one off-street parking space for each four to six beds.

Mr. Passmore advised the Commission that plans which had been submitted with the subject application indicated a lot coverage of (86 percent), a twelve-foot rear yard, and the provision of fifteen off-street parking spaces for a ratio of one parking space for each six beds. In conclusion, he stated that the subject lot could be developed residentially with a maximum of 44 dwelling units.

William L. Ferdon, attorney for the applicants, displayed a series of photographs which had been taken of the subject lot. He stated that the subject property had been vacant for a long period of time; and, during the two-year period that the site had been owned by his clients, they had been urged repeatedly to clean up the lot or to do something with it. As indicated in the photographs, the lot had been used as a parking lot by residents of the neighborhood; and, in spite of the fact that chains had been installed to keep automobiles out, that deterrent had been ineffective. Mr. Ferdon remarked on the fact that a great deal of parking space is available along the perimeters of Alta Plaza; however, many homes in the neighborhood do not have garages. In any case, he did not feel that the project proposed by his clients would add to the parking congestion in the area.

Mr. Ferdon displayed and described the plans which had been prepared for the proposed building and suggested that the building would considerably enhance the neighborhood. In fact, the only aesthetic objection raised by residents of the neighborhood was to the effect that a different color of brick would be preferable. He stated that the building would cost $800,000 to construct; and it would be furnished with $250,000 worth of equipment. The City would derive $24,000 a year in property taxes and $3,000 a year in personal property taxes from the project. The hospital would have 65 employees, fifty or sixty percent of whom would be drawn from minority groups.

Mr. Ferdon felt that it was clear that additional convalescent hospital facilities are needed in San Francisco in spite of the fact that one of the residents of the subject neighborhood had been quoted in the newspapers as having said that the City is saturated with such facilities. That individual had also seemed to be concerned about parking problems, in spite of the fact that he himself is the owner of four multi-unit buildings in the area which have no garage space whatsoever. Yet, whereas the City Planning Code would require provision of only one parking space for every eight beds, the applicants, had proposed to provide one parking space for every six beds to be located in the proposed facility. In any case, very few visitors come to convalescent hospitals;

and, in the present case, good public transportation would be available for the hospital's employees. Therefore, he did not feel that the proposed facility would contribute to parking congestion in the area.

Mr. Ferdon advised the Commission that a sign had been posted on his client's property urging residents of the area to come to the Commission meeting to oppose the subject application because of the threat which the convalescent hospital would pose for the residential character and value of the neighborhood. He acknowledged that the hospital might inconvenience some of the people in the neighborhood to some extent; nevertheless, he felt that the hospital would enhance the area rather than destroy its value or its residential character. If the convalescent hospital were not to be constructed, a 44-unit apartment building could be built on the site; and, while he did not know whether such construction would be more or less appealing to residents of the neighborhood, he felt that it would obviously pose greater parking problems for the area.

Richard Bancroft, a property owner in the subject neighborhood and an attorney, represented the Alta Plaza Park Row Improvement Association, Inc. He advised the Commission that a grant deed of trust had been filed with the Recorder's Office on December 7, 1968, placing title to the subject property in a partnership under the name of Sacramento Street Properties; and, under the circumstances, he questioned whether the individuals who had filed the subject application actually had an interest in the property. He called attention to the number of people who were present from the subject neighborhood in opposition to the subject application; and, if those individuals were given an opportunity to speak, he believed that they would be able to persuade the Commission that the proposed convalescent hospital should not be located in the subject neighborhood. He referred to the proposed building as a "five-story monster" which would have ninety convalescent hospital beds and which would provide only the bare minimum of parking required by the City Planning Code; and he emphasized that the building, as designed, would be undesirable for patients since the rooms would obtain light and air only from lightwells.

Mr. Bancroft stated that he was not opposed to the construction of new convalescent hospitals in San Francisco; however, if new facilities were to be constructed, he felt that they should provide low-cost care in a pleasant environment and that they should be located in appropriate surroundings under proper zoning conditions. Furthermore, he felt that any convalescent hospitals approved should provide adequate parking facilities. He indicated that he was opposed to the convalescent hospital presently under consideration because its promoters had not made any pledge or promise to provide beds for Medi-Care or Medi-Cal patients, because the hospital would cover 85 percent of the subject lot and dwarf all other buildings in the area, and because it would undo the constructive improvements which had been made by property owners in the subject neighborhood during a recently completed Federally-Assisted Code Enforcement Program. He also submitted that San Francisco will be "overbuilt" in terms of convalescent hospital facilities when all of the facilities presently under construction or already approved by the City Planning Commission have been completed. In his opinion, construction of a multi-unit apartment building on the subject site would constitute the highest

and best use of the property; but, in any case, he did not feel that construction of the proposed convalescent hospital would be appropriate. In conclusion, he submitted petitions which had been signed by residents of the neighborhood in opposition to the subject application.

George Brady, president of the Alta Plaza Park Row Improvement Association, Inc., noted that many of the buildings in the subject block have been outstandingly restored; and he did not feel that construction of the proposed convalescent hospital within one hundred yards of those buildings would be appropriate. He remarked that the five-story height of the proposed building would dwarf other buildings in the area; and the facility would surely generate serious parking problems in the area. In conclusion, Mr. Brady emphasized that the subject neighborhood has no need for the type of facility which the applicants were proposing to construct.

Vice President Kearney noted that many other people were present in the audience who wished to speak in opposition to the application. However, he felt that the basic objections to the proposal had already been well stated; and he requested that other comments be deferred until the Commission had received the Director's recommendation.

The Director recommended that the subject application be disapproved. In his opinion, the subject site was not an appropriate or desirable one for a convalescent hospital in view of the recent data developed on the need for convalescent hospitals in San Francisco, which data showed that the need for additional convalescent facilities is only marginal and that the subject neighborhood is already served by a number of existing convalescent hospitals. Addionally, the hospital which had been proposed would be adverse to the neighborhood due to its lack of yard space; and it would not appear to provide good living areas for the potential patients who would reside in the building. Therefore, he submitted a draft resolution of disapproval and recommended its adoption.

Mr. Ferdon stated that his clients definitely intended to take care of Medi-Cal and Medi-Care patients in the proposed facility. He remarked that the objections raised by the Director seemed to be related principally to the design of the proposed building; and, if that were the case, he believed that the problems could be worked out by the applicants' architects. With regard to the question of need, he emphasized that his clients would not have planned to invest their money in such a facility unless they had been convinced that there would be a demand for the type of service to be provided.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the subject application be disapproved.

Commissioner Brinton remarked that figures which had been compiled by the staff of the Department of City Planning had indicated that San Francisco may have an excess of convalescent hospital beds when all of the hospitals which have already been approved have been constructed; and, for that reason, he felt that the subject application should be disapproved.

Commissioner Porter stated that her reasons for seconding the motion of disapproval were different from those expressed by Commissioner Brinton. She felt that the Commission should be concerned with the possible impact of buildings such as the one presently being proposed on residential neighborhoods; and, since she believed that the project presently under consideration would have a detrimental affect on the subject residential neighborhood, she was prepared to vote for its disapproval.

After further discussion the question was called, and the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6367 and to disapprove the subject application.

At 4:50 p.m. Vice President Kearney announced that the meeting was recessed. The Commission reconvened at 5:00 p.m. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the calendar. Commissioner Miller was temporarily absent from the meeting room.

CU69.22 1200 Clayton Street, southwest corner of 17th Street
To increase Lot coverage as part of the reconstruction and modernization of a service station

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant proposed to expand the lot coverage of the existing service station on the site as a part of a proposed modernization of the station area. The modernization would involve the addition of pump-island canopies, landscaping, remodeling of the station building, and new water and drainage features. Because the service station is a nonconforming use in an R-3 district, and because the addition of pump-island canopies would technically increase the lot coverage of the service station to more than thirty percent of the site, conditional use approval would have to be obtained from the Commission for the proposed project.

Mr. Day, Real Estate representative for the Shell Oil Company, remarked that the addition of the island canopies would not really constitute an "expansion" of the service station use. He believed that other details of the application had been covered adequately by Mr. Passmore; thus, without commenting further, he urged that the application be approved.

The Director recommended approval of the subject application. He noted that the expansion project would involve only the addition of a canopy over existing gasoline pumps; and, since the project would also involve landscaping of the site and other means of enhancing the current appearance of the site to make it more compatible with surrounding residential developments, he felt that the application should be approved. After distributing a draft resolution of approval to members of the Commission, he recommended its adoption.

Commissioner Brinton asked if the applicants would be willing to comply with the three conditions contained in the draft resolution. Mr. Day replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6368 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions in the draft resolution.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Miller returned to the meeting room and re-assumed his chair.

CU69.23 701 Scott Street, northwest corner of Grove Street
Expansion of existing rest home from six to eight beds; and

CU69.24 709 Scott Street, west side, 82.5 feet north of Grove Street
Expansion of existing rest home from six to eight beds

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, suggested that these two applications be considered together because of their basic similarities. After referring to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject properties, he stated that both applicants wished to expand the occupancy of their existing rest homes from six to eight beds without enlarging the existing structures.

Wellie Glover, owner of the property located at 701 Scott Street, stated that each of her six patients pays only $188 a month for their care, providing her with an income of only $1.60 per hour; and, since all of the food, clothing, and other necessities of the patients must be provided for out of that small income, she found it very difficult to operate with any margin of profit. Her licensing agent had advised her that her home would accommodate up to four more patients; and she believed that it would be most helpful to her if the Commission would approve the two additional patients presently being requested. In conclusion, she stated that there is a great need for rest home facilities for aged people who are on Welfare.

The Director recommended approval of Mrs. Glover's application subject to conditions. He remarked that the existing rest home is an acceptable and desirable medical facility in the subject neighborhood; and he felt that the addition of two beds would not change the existing compatibility of the building. Yet, approval of the application would provide further medical service for the community. After distributing a draft resolution of approval for consideration by the Commission, he recommended its adoption.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6369 be adopted and that application CU69.23 be approved subject to two conditions.

Subsequently, the Director recommended approval of application No. CU69.24 for the same reasons previously cited.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Brinton, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6370 be adopted and that application CU69.24 be approved with two conditions.

CU69.26 1325-1335 Pine Street, south side, 100 feet west of Hyde Street
Expansion of a parking lot

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the St. Francis Memorial Hospital, the applicant, was requesting permission to install a seventeen-car parking lot on the subject property as part of an expansion of the existing adjoing lot. He indicated that the parking lot would have a direct connection to the basement garage at 909 Hyde Street on the northwest corner of Hyde and Bush Streets. The lot would be operated by a commercial parking lot firm, but it would be primarily for the use of St. Francis Hospital's visitors and employees.

Edward DeLear, Associate Administrator of St. Francis Hospital, felt that the details of the application had been adequately summarized by Mr. Passmore; he indicated, however, that he was present to answer any questions which might be raised by members of the Commission.

The Director recommended that the application be approved subject to five conditions. He remarked that there is a need for additional parking in the vicinity of St. Francis Hospital, both for people going to the hospital and for others who work or reside in the adjacent high-density residential neighborhood. He believed that the connection of the proposed parking lot to the existing garage at Hyde and Bush Streets would help to eliminate the current traffic congestion problem caused by the garage. He distributed copies of the draft resolution which he had prepared to members of the Commission for their consideration; and, after summarizing the conditions which it contained, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. DeLear stated that St. Francis Hospital would be willing to conform to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No 6371 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

ZM69.14 and CU69.28 Carter Street, west side, 440 feet south of Geneva Avenue
A sixteen acre site partially in Daly City, south of Castle Lane School and west of Geneva Drive-In Theatre

Reclassification from R-1-D and C-2 districts to R-1 district; and
Authorization for a planned unit development with a total of 264 units (in approximately 22 low-rise buildings), 125 of which will be in San Francisco;
Proposed planned unit development also includes commercial and recreational facilities for use of residents only.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had requested reclassification of the subject lot from R-1-D and C-2 to R-1 and a conditional use authorization for a planned unit development to allow construction of approximately 112 dwelling units on the San Francisco portion of the property at a density of one dwelling unit per approximately 1,500 square feet of net lot area. Because of the jurisdictional boundary running through the property, the proposed development would require agreements between San Francisco and Daly City and San Mateo County concerning the provision of water, sewer, police, and fire services, and also means of tax assessments; however, while discussions on those aspects of the matter had been commenced between the governmental agencies concerned, no agreement had yet been reached. He believed, however, that a resolution of those problems would be feasible. In conclusion, he stated that Daly City had already indicated its general agreement with the applicant's proposal.

Bob Meyer, representing J. H. Hedrick Company, believed that the proposal had been covered adequately by Mr. Passmore; and he indicated that the only additional comment which he wished to make was that the project would include extensive recreational facilities and a great deal of open space.

Commissioner Newman asked if the project would be designed primarily for families. Mr. Meyer replied in the negative, indicating that the project would be open only to adults.

A member of the audience asked how high the proposed buildings would be. Mr. Meyer replied that the buildings would be between eighty and one hundred feet below any of the buildings located on the top of the hill. In any case, he emphasized that none of the buildings proposed would interfere with views from existing buildings in the vicinity.

Commissioner Brinton asked if the economics of the project had been responsible for the applicant's decision that the apartments should be rented only to adults. Mr. Meyer replied that his firm had constructed similar projects

in other communities; and they had found that children on the grounds tend to interfere with young adults who wish to use the swimming pools and other recreational facilities which would be provided. Furthermore, he pointed out that the subject project would be isolated from the community; and he indicated that adequate school facilities do not exist in the area to accommodate additional children.

Commissioner Porter asked if the proposed apartments would be of the "luxury unit" type. Mr. Meyer replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Porter then asked if the newspapers had been correct in their report that the project would cater to airline personnel. Mr. Meyer again replied in the affirmative. He indicated that apartments in the project would rent from $160 to $360, unfurnished.

Commissioner Miller asked how many one-bedroom apartments would be provided in the project. Mr. Meyer replied that the project would contain 110 one-bedroom apartments and 44 three-bedroom apartments; the remainder of the apartments would have two bedrooms each.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended approval of the request for reclassification of the subject property from R-1-D and C-2 to R-1 as an appropriate expansion of the existing R-1 district to the west. He believed that the slightly higher residential density would encourage residential development of the subject parcel, thus providing housing currently needed in the area.

Commissioner Newman asked what would happen in the event that the project were to be disapproved by Daly City. The Director replied that one of the conditions contained in the draft resolution which he had prepared for approval of the planned unit development application would make approval of that application contingent upon concurrent approval by the City of Daly City.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6372 be adopted and that application ZM69.14 be approved.

Subsequently, the Director distributed a draft resolution of approval for application CU69.28. He then asked Mr. Passmore to read the ten conditions which were contained in the draft resolution.

Mr. Meyer stated that he had no objection to the conditions which were contained in the draft resolution.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried 5 - 1 that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6373 and that application CU69.28 be approved subject to the ten conditions contained in the draft resolution. Commissioners Finn, Kearney, Miller, Newman, and Porter voted "Aye"; Commissioner Brinton voted "No".

Commissioner Brinton stated that he had voted against the subject application because of the applicant's stated policy of excluding families with children from the project.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, May 8, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, May 8, 1969, at 2:15 P.M. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, Thomas J. Mellon, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Commissioners James K. Carr, Mortimer Fleishhaker, and James S. Kearney.

The Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean R. Macris, Assistant Director--Plans and Programs; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of April 3, 1969, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that the Department of City Planning had been requested by the Streets and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors to submit a report and recommendation in a resolution pending before that Committee which would memorialize the State Division of Highways to approve the extension of the existing "stubs" of the Embarcadero Freeway to connect with the Embarcadero Parkway. The Committee hopes to receive a reply before May 22.

The Director advised the Commission that a letter had been sent to the Advisory Committee to the State Office of Planning inviting them to attend the City Planning Commission's meeting on June 12 for a status report on the Urban Design Study. However, he had since been advised that the Committee is being re-organized; and he is planning to meet on May 13 with a representative of the State Planning Office to discuss the type of liaison which the State will maintain in the future.

The director informed the Commission that the Joint Venture is approaching completion of its preliminary designs for Market Street.

Commissioner Newman asked if the City Planning Commission would have an opportunity to review the preliminary design plans for Market Street. The Director replied that he would be pleased to bring the plans before the Commission as an informational item.

Commissioner Porter asked when plans for the proposed Transamerica Building would come before the Commission for discussion and review. The Director stated that he had recently written a letter to the President of the Transamerica Corporation advising him that consideration of certain aspects of the project would be scheduled as soon as revised plans for the building are received.

REFERRALS

R69.11 Baker Street, Dissolved Air Flotation Facility, Lyon Street in Marina Yacht Harbor, and

R69.23 Vacation of a portion of Lyon Street north of Marina Boulevard.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on these matters as follows:

"The purpose of the proposed facility is to provide treatment for combined sewage and storm water in those periods when the rainfall is greater than the capacity of the existing sewage treatment plants. The facility will consist of underground tanks, a 54 by 60-foot, one-story control building, an influent sewer, and a submerged discharge pipe extending 200 to 250 feet out from the shoreline, 25 feet below mean low water. Coarse material will be screened out, stored in the control building, and trucked away, settleable and suspended material removed and pumped to the North Point sewage treatment plant, and the effluent disinfected with chlorine. The total project cost will be $1,500,000 including evaluation studies, of which $921,000 will be financed by a Federal grant. It is a demonstration project for the purpose of determining whether this kind of treatment is adequate.

Although the proposed facility was listed in the January 1969 City Planning Commission's Capital Improvement Program for the fiscal year 1969-70 as in conformity with the Master Plan, a specific location had not been selected at that time. The location now proposed is primarily within the right-of-way of Lyon Street north of the point where it curves to the east within the Marina Yacht Harbor, and a street vacation is being requested for the portion of Lyon Street to be occupied by the facility. The one-story control building will be out of the way of traffic next to the Presidio boundary and will be landscaped. A roadway at least 40 feet wide will remain. The underground tanks will have to be located in part under Recreation and Park Department property to the north of the control building; Recreation and Park Commission gave its approval in principle on March 27, 1969, and will further review the final plans. At the request of the Recreation and Park Commission, public restrooms are to be included in the building so that the old convenience station on the east side of Lyon Street can be removed. Also at its

request, a tiled terrace will be provided over the underground facilities between the building and the beach.

The Art Commission reviewed and approved the plans on April 28.

The area to be served lies roughly between Marina Boulevard and Clay Street, Divisadero and Maple Street. The Yacht Harbor will benefit from the improved quality of water, and the existing Baker Street outfall will be removed from its present conspicuous location at the foot of Baker Street."

The Director recommended that both the vacation of the subject portion of Lyon Street and construction of the proposed Dissolved Air Flotation Facility be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed Baker Street Dissolved Air Flotation Facility is in conformity with the Master plan and that the vacation of the portion of Lyon Street north of Marina Blvd. which is required for the facility is in conformity with the master plan.

R69.25 Portions of Blocks 3925 and 3926, jurisdictional transfer from Purchaser to Bureau of Light, Heat and Power.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The property requested for jurisdictional transfer by the Public Utilities Commission's Bureau of Light, Heat and Power is a 30,800 square foot open storage yard directly north of the Purchaser's warehouse in Block 3925 at 15th and Harrison Streets in the M-1 zone. The Property is currently leased on a month to month basis to a truck wrecking firm.

The Bureau of Light, Heat and Power proposes to use the property as a storage facility and test site for street lighting equipment. This use is permitted in the M-1 zone but should be conducted entirely within an area completely enclosed by a wall or concealing fence not less than six feet high (City Planning Code Section 225(j). The area is now enclosed by a chain link fence with a solid board fence along one section.

The Director of Property has also inquired as to whether the jurisdictional transfer of Lot 4 in Block 3926 to the Bureau of Light, Heat and Power for additional storage space is in conformity with the Master Plan. This property was formerly the City's gas station site to the south of the Purchaser's warehouse and is a triangular parcel of approximately 3825 square feet, now also used for private storage.

After various City uses formerly occupying these two parcels were transferred to new facilities in the Islais Creek area, the Purchaser declared them surplus. The City Planning Commission found that their sale was in conformity with the Master Plan, the gas station site in 1961 (R61.100) and the larger parcel in 1963 (R63.62). Subsequently, in 1964, the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors recommended to the Board and the Board agreed that the parcels should be leased rather than sold.

The proposed transfer and use of the properties appears advantageous. The Purchaser has no objection to the transfer. The Bureau of Light, Heat and Power, however, should comply with the provisions of the City Planning Code by providing a concealing fence around the facility."

The Director recommended that the proposed jurisdictional transfer of property be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Porter noted that the City Planning Commission had recommended legislation to the Board of Supervisors which would require that automobile wrecking yards and storage yards be screened from adjacent properties; and she felt that it was important that the same standards should apply to the storage lot that was being proposed by the Bureau of Light, Heat and Power. The Director agreed; and he noted that Mr. Jung had indicated that the Bureau of Light, Heat and Power should comply with the provisions of the City Planning Code by providing a concealing fence around the proposed facility.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the proposed jurisdictional transfer of the portion of Lot 2, Block 3925, and of Lot 4, Block 3926, from the Purchaser to the Bureau of Light, Heat and Power is in conformity with the Master Plan. The Commission also asked that the provisions of City Planning Code Section 225(j) for a concealing fence not less than six feet high be observed.

R118.69.2 Tentative condominium subdivision maps, Mandarin Tower, Stockton Street, southeast corner of Washington Street.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, reported on this matter as follows:

"This building is currently under construction and is estimated to be approximately 70% complete. The bottom five floors, including basement, are to be occupied by commercial activities, the top 12 floors are apartment floors of six units each, for a total of 72 apartments. There is no off-street parking provided in the building. It is proposed to subdivide the property into a condominium in which the commercial space will be retained in one ownership, but the apartment space will be separated into 72 ownerships. Each of the owners will have an equal share in the common areas comprised of the lobby, elevators, hallways and building walls on the commercial floors and the apartment floors.

The creation of a condominium would have no effect on the design or use of the building now under construction."

Commissioner Brinton, noting that the building would house both residential and commercial uses, asked if he was correct in his recollection that the building had originally been proposed exclusively for residential use. Mr. Passmore replied that both the bottom floors and the top floor of the building had been proposed for commercial use. However, the developers now planned to use only the lower floors for commercial activities.

Commissioner Porter asked about the present zoning on the subject site. Mr. Passmore replied that the site is zoned C-3-G; and he indicated that the building would comply with most of the standards of that district. The height of the building would exceed the 160-foot height limit because no height limit existed when the building permit was approved for the project.

The Director recommended that the tentative condominium subdivision map be approved as submitted.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the tentative condominium subdivision map, "Mandarin Tower", pages 3-19, received by the Department of City Planning April 14, 1969, be approved as submitted.

REVIEW OF STATUS OF BASIC POLICIES REPORT

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, and Dean R. Macris, Assistant Director--Plans and Programs, described the steps which had been taken toward preparation of a report on San Francisco's basic policies and objectives and summarized the types of issues which will be covered in the final report. Mr. Macris emphasized that the staff of the Department of City Planning had been working very closely with other operating agencies to synthesize and coordinate the basic objectives and policies of the city.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 P.M.

Respectively submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, May 15, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, May 15, 1969, at 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., President; William M. Brinton, Thomas J. Mellon, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: James S. Kearney, Vice President; and James K. Carr, member.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; William Proctor, Planner IV; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Marie Carlberg, Planner III; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

1:00 P. M. - Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m. to take a field trip to some of the properties which will be considered during the Commission's zoning hearing on June 5; the remainder of the properties will be visited next week.

2:15 p.m. - 100 Larkin Street

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of April 17, 1969, be approved as submitted.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Mellon arrived in the Commission room and assumed his chair.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported on the deletions from the Department of City Planning budget for the next fiscal year which had been recommended by the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors.

The Director informed the Commission that the Planning and Development Committee and Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors, meeting jointly on

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, May 14, 1959.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, May 14, 1959, at 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Mrs. Charles Lizarraga, Vice President; Mr. Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., Mr. Walter S. Newman, Mr. Hector E. Rueda, Mr. Wm. M. Wolf, and Mr. Walter S. Tellman, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Mr. Thomas J. Mellon, President; and Mr. Wm. Wilson Wurster, member.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; William Proctor, Planner IV; Daniel Sack, Planner IV; Marie Carlberg, Planner III; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Dennis Gordon represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blake represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

1:00 P.M. - Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from the Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m. to make a field trip to some of the developments which the Commission discussed during the Commissioner's weekly hearing on June 5; the results of the proceedings will be written later.

2:15 p.m. - City Planning Commission

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of April 16, 1959, be approved as submitted.

At this point in the proceedings, Mr. Walter S. Tellman arrived in the Commission room and assumed his chair.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported on the deliberations from the Commission on City Planning Budget for the next fiscal year which had been recommended by the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors.

The Director introduced the Chairman of the Planning and Development Committee and Mr. Wm. Lee, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, meeting jointly on

Wednesday, had approved the FACE programs proposed for Alamo Square, Bernal Heights, and the Duboce Triangle.

The Director submitted and read a memorandum which he had prepared in response to a request from the Board of Supervisors concerning a proposal to connect the existing double-deck elevated Embarcadero Freeway with the Northern Waterfront Plan's proposed parkway. During the course of his report, he noted that routing of the freeway traffic directly onto the present Embarcadero would probably add congestion to the existing roadway; and, as a result, the ramp construction would probably have to await construction of the parkway proposed in the Northern Waterfront Plan. Since the development of the parkway might take a considerable amount of time, the value of the proposed ramps as an immediate solution of the Telegraph Hill traffic problem would be eliminated. While the Northern Waterfront Plan did not propose or recommend the construction of a new freeway through the Northern Waterfront area to connect the Embarcadero Freeway with the Golden Gate Bridge, it had indicated that any such connection made in the future should be either entirely or substantially underground; and the Plan had also recommended that the elevated portion of the Embarcadero Freeway from south of the Ferry Building to Broadway should be replaced by a subsurface freeway system. Under the circumstances, construction of the ramps presently being considered, because of the expense involved, would tend to "freeze" the existence of the present elevated Embarcadero Freeway structure. Furthermore, the extension of the present elevated structure in the form of ramp to bring it to the surface of the Embarcadero could only have a detrimental affect on the development potential of the Northern Waterfront area and would be contrary to the Plan's urban design policies.

The Director further noted that the Northern Waterfront Plan contains an alternate solution to the construction of the proposed ramps by establishing Battery and Sansome Streets and Bay and North Point Streets as one-way pairs with proper signalization and channelization at The Embarcadero in each case. He believed that such a revised traffic pattern would substantially reduce the amount of traffic now going through the Telegraph Hill area.

In conclusion, the Director recommended that he be authorized to report to the Streets and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors at its next meeting against the proposed ramp construction for the following reasons:

"1. That additional investment for the improvement of the Embarcadero Freeway structure, or for addition to it, would make it more difficult to put the freeway underground or below grade in the future; and,

2. That further expansion of the elevated structure would be detrimental to the development of the Northern Waterfront Area; and,

3. That relief for the traffic congestion may be accomplished by putting into effect the one-way street proposals of the Northern Waterfront Plan."

President Fleishhacker, noting that the Director had remarked that the expense of constructing the proposed ramp might tend to "freeze" the existence of the present elevated Embarcadero Freeway structure, asked what estimate had been made of the probable cost of the ramps. The Director replied that the construction project would probably cost approximately $2 million dollars.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report to the Streets and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors that ramps should not be constructed to connect the Embarcadero Freeway to the surface of The Embarcadero north of Broadway for the reasons cited by the Director in his report.

Commissioner Porter, referring to the Director's report on deletions from the Department's budget for the next fiscal year, asked if the Urban Design Study would be affected by the cuts. The Director replied in the negative, indicating that the deletions would primarily affect the comprehensive planning program of the Department; at the same time, however, the Department's ability to prepare nonscheduled reports on the request of the Mayor or the Board of Supervisors would be drastically reduced.

R64.99 Proposed vacation of a portion of Union Street east of Montgomery Street.

Marie Carlberg, Planner III, summarized the background of the subject street vacation request, noting that the matter had been considered innumerable times by various committees of the Board of Supervisors and by many interdepartmental staff committees since the time that the City Planning Commission made its first report on the proposal in January, 1965. The background details are fully outlined in a memorandum dated May 12, 1969, which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning.

Finally, in 1966, the City Attorney had recommended a solution which was acceptable to both of the property owners involved: An agreement between the two for the use of an 8 x 11-foot area of the sidewalk adjacent to the east end of Lot 16A for a stairway to the living areas of the building on Lot 16, the City to grant a revocable permit to the owner of Lot 16 for the stairway area.

Miss Carlberg continued her report as follows:

"The City Attorney in the same letter opinion also recommended that the owner of Lot 16A should be granted permission to use an 11-foot strip of the sidewalk, exclusive of the 8 x 11-foot portion to be used for the neighbor's stairway, for garages

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

and for access to his proposed new building, provided that this use create no incursion upon the air space in excess of that created by the existing elevated sidewalk, or in excess of that otherwise satisfactory to the Department of City Planning and the Department of Public Works.

The City Attorney stated that this permission should be effected preferably by revocable permit. He also suggested another means, which is the basis for the present referral: vacation of the portion of the sidewalk desired by the owner of Lot 16A, the City retaining the fee title to this portion but granting an easement to the owner for construction of garages and access. The owner's architect has submitted a plan showing a horizontal encroachment of 5 feet into the Union Street sidewalk, as opposed to the 11.3 feet of the present elevated sidewalk, extending 56.08 feet in the east-west direction to allow the neighbor's stairway at the east end, but extending vertically from the curb elevation at the corner of Union and Montgomery to a height of 9 feet in contrast to the 3½-foot height of the present elevated sidewalk. The result would be a significant increase in building bulk.

The proposal meets a previous objection of the City Planning Commission to the vacation on the grounds that the increased lot area would permit additional dwelling units and therefore not be in accord with the density standards of the Land Use Plan, but it does not meet the objection concerning the facade line on Union Street because of the increased vertical encroachment. It would increase the permitted intensity of building for this one owner in an R-4 area which is already intensely built. There are other similar situations in the neighborhood where it would be much more convenient for the owners to provide for their parking needs within street rights-of-way than on their own lot area; if this privilege is granted to all, it will result in a much higher degree of building intensity. That the neighboring owner was permitted this privilege, for a much smaller lot and below the level of the existing elevated sidewalk, is an object lesson: it is cited as a precedent for permitting an encroachment above the level of the existing elevated sidewalk.

After the City Attorney's letter opinion was issued, the then Director of Planning was asked by Supervisor Morrison

to review it and offer further comments and advice, which he did in letters dated February 24, 1966 and March 24, 1966. In the latter letter he recommended that if the Supervisors did decide to accept the City Attorney's recommendation to grant permission to the owner of Lot 16A to use a part of the area of the existing elevated sidewalk for garages, that such permission apply only to the area at and below the level of the existing elevated sidewalk."

Jeremy Harrison, attorney for Mr. and Mrs. Rodriguez, the owners of Lot 16A, advised the Commission that the building presently occupying the site covers one hundred percent of the lot. Since the building had been condemned, his clients had wished to tear it down and to construct a new building on the site which would cover only ninety percent of the lot. He emphasized that the existing elevated sidewalk is used only by his clients and by the owners of the adjacent lot; and, thus, if the elevated sidewalk were removed to enable his clients to construct parking spaces which would be required for their new building, the public would not be inconvenienced. In fact, if the elevated sidewalk were removed, a six-foot-wide sidewalk would be provided at grade which could be used by the public. He stated that the City Planning Code would allow his clients to build six new units on the site; however, in order to meet the one for one parking requirement of the City Planning Code, garage spaces would have to be constructed with access from Union Street through the area now occupied by the elevated sidewalk. In conclusion, he emphasized that the easement presently being requested from the City would not permit any additional dwelling units to be constructed on the subject site.

President Fleishhacker, remarking that Mr. Harrison had indicated that the new building would have only a ninety percent lot coverage as opposed to the one hundred percent lot coverage of the existing building, asked which portion of the lot would be left vacant. Mr. Harrison replied that a six-foot rear yard would be provided on the site.

President Fleishhacker indicated that some of the members of the Commission had visited the subject site during their field trip earlier in the afternoon; and it seemed to him that provision of the parking spaces proposed for the building would result in the loss of several existing curb spaces. The Director confirmed that approximately four curb spaces would have to be removed if the building were to be constructed as proposed.

Mr. Harrison stated that his clients would have been agreeable to the Commission's earlier suggestion that use of the sidewalk area be permitted through a revocable permit; however, their bank had not been willing to loan them money for the construction project on the basis of a revocable permit. Therefore, it seemed to him that the easement presently being requested should be satisfactory both to his clients and to the City.

[illegible]

Commissioner Newman asked how much the proposed vertical bulk in the sidewalk area would be increased over the present vertical height of the elevated sidewalk. Mr. Harrison replied that the proposed vertical bulk would be 5½ feet higher than the elevated sidewalk.

Mr. Sterling, owner of Lot 16, stated that he had been opposed to the applicants' first proposal since that project would have involved loss of access to his building; however, he was protected by the fact that he has a legal right to use the elevated sidewalk for access. However, if the compromise suggested by the City Attorney were acceptable to the Commission, he would be willing to request a revocable permit for construction of a new stairway on a portion of the sidewalk area; and, after receiving permission for that project, he would be willing to waive his legal right of access by way of the elevated sidewalk.

Allen Lathrop, vice president of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, stated that his organization was opposed to the vacation of any portion of the subject sidewalk. In his opinion, any new building constructed on the property owned by Mr. and Mrs. Rodriguez should be confined to the boundaries of that site and should not make use of City-owned property; and, in any case, he felt that the lot owned by Mr. and Mrs. Rodriguez is sufficiently large in and of itself to allow construction of an economically feasible building.

Carol Schwartzback, chairman of the Zoning Committee of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, remarked that Mr. Harrison had urged that his clients be treated equally with other property owners who are allowed to construct one parking space for each residential unit; however, she felt that no other 1,200 square-foot lot exists in the City which could accommodate more than three on-site parking spaces. In that sense, she felt that the one for one parking requirement of the City Planning Code is more restrictive than the standards of the R-3 zoning district; and, by requesting permission to use City-owned property for the construction project, she felt that Mr. Harrison was actually asking for an unfair advantage for his clients.

Melbert Ransom, an attorney, felt that the request for vacation of the street should be denied.

The Secretary called attention to two letters which had been received in opposition to the applicants' proposal. The first was from Mrs. Kenneth Evers, writing on behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, stating that the applicants' problem had arisen because they wished to place a larger building on their property than the size of the site would justify; and, since use of the sidewalk area in the manner proposed would impair one of the most spectacular views in San Francisco, she felt that the public property involved should be retained for public use. However, if some further adjustment of the use of the property owned by the Rodriguezes should be deemed necessary, she suggested that the adjustment should be in the nature of a variance from the one for one off-street parking

requirement to the extent of requiring only five parking spaces for six units. While that solution did not seem to be altogether desirable, she felt that it would be the least harmful to the environment and to the rights and privileges of the neighbors and the public in general.

The second letter, from John B. Harmon, 1403 Montgomery Street, questioned the legal right of the City to authorize private use of public property merely for the economic benefit of a private property owner, particularly when such use of public property would interfere with sight lines and view corridors and break the facade line along Union Street.

The Director recommended re-affirmation of the City Planning Commission's action of January 14, 1965: That vacation of a portion of Union Street east of Montgomery Street is in conflict with the Master Plan. He stated that the present proposal would result in a higher degree of building intensity and would break the facade line on Union Street with an adverse affect on the appearance of the street. The additional precedent of allowing the substantial expansion of a building into the street area could have serious consequences for Telegraph Hill as well as for other areas of the City. He further recommended that any permit which the Board of Supervisors might decide to grant to the petitioner be a revocable permit and that it extend only to the height of the existing elevated sidewalk so that the present facade on Union Street will not be broken.

The Director also remarked that the plans which had been prepared by the architect for the applicants had indicated that one of the parking spaces would be in direct line with a pedestrian crosswalk; and he felt that such a situation would be most undesirable. Furthermore, three or four existing curb spaces would have to be removed to provide on-site parking spaces in accordance with the plans. Under the circumstances, he personally felt that little would be gained from strict adherence to the one for one parking requirement of the City Planning Code. He pointed out, however, that the heater room and garage room in the proposed building could be relocated to the site of the parking space on Montgomery Street which would interfere with the crosswalk; and, as a result, sufficient depth should be available to provide three parking spaces with access from Union Street. He believed that it would be feasible for the applicants' architect to make such revision; and, if so, a total of five parking spaces could be provided on the site without requring use of the sidewalk area. If the applicants were willing to consider such modifications, they could then request a variance of one parking space from the Zoning Administrator. While he emphasized that the final decision would have to be made by the Zoning Administrator, he felt that such a solution to the problem would be reasonable.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton and seconded by Commissioner Newman that the vacation of the subject portion of Union Street be found in conflict with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Brinton stated that he did not object to the applicants' request for an easement over City property since such an easement would not involve a gift of property or of property rights; however, he did object to the structure which the applicants proposed to construct on the sidewalk area which would interfere with the Union Street facade line.

Mr. Harrison stated that the facade line would be the only element of the existing situation which would be affected by the proposed project since the sidewalk area had been occupied for private access purposes for the past thirty years. If the access problem did not exist, there would be no question but what his clients would be permitted to build six units and six garages on their site; however, they would be denied the enjoyment of that right if the access problem could not be solved.

President Fleishhacker asked if it would still be possible to construct five garages on the site if a stairway were to be constructed to give access to the adjacent property. Mr. Harrison replied that he was not able to answer the question because of his lack of architectural knowledge. The only solution which he could see would be for his clients to build fewer units on the site; however, he felt that such a solution would unduly penalize them.

Mr. Sterling stated that almost all of the property owners along Union Street have illegal encroachments into the sidewalk area; and he felt that the legal encroachment requested by the Rodriguezes would not be detrimental to the neighborhood.

After further discussion, the question was called and the Commission voted unanimously to authorize the Director to report that the proposed vacation of a portion of Union Street east of Montgomery Street is in conflict with the Master Plan.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF MECHANICAL CAR WASH PROPOSED FOR SOUTHEAST CORNER OF DUBOCE AVENUE AND VALENCIA STREET; Assessor's Block 3532, Lots 34 and 37; in a C-M zoning district.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, commented on the fact that an amendment to the City Planning Code to allow mechanical car washes as conditional uses in C-M and C-2 zoning districts is presently pending before the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors; and he indicated that the subject permit application had been brought to the attention of the Commission due to the pending Code amendment and because of staff concern about traffic circulation problems which would be caused at the subject site by the car wash. After describing the subject property and the improvements which the applicant proposed to place on the site, he informed the Commission that the applicant had stated that the capacity of the car wash could be adjusted to wash up to eighty cars per hour, although it would usually operate at about sixty to seventy cars per hour. While the City Planning Code presently requires that car

washes located in C-M districts must have a reservoir for car storage equal to one-fourth of the hourly capacity of the facility, the site plan for the proposed facility indicated that reservoir space would be available for the storage of only fourteen automobiles.

Mr. Passmore stated that the proposed plans had also been reviewed by the Bureau of Traffic Engineering; and, after their review, the City Engineer had recommended denial of the application in a letter which read, in part, as follows:

> "It is our opinion that a line of six or more vehicles on Valencia Street will form during hours of peak demand at this facility. Since BART construction now in progress has reduced the capability of Mission Street to function as a carrier of heavy traffic volumes, the use of Valencia Street has increased, and any additional load will only serve to aggravate the situation. For this reason, we believe that no access should be allowed from Valencia Street for this type of use.
>
> Additionally, we feel that no access should be allowed from Duboce Avenue for this type of use as this will result in blocking the intersection periodically as well as causing traffic problems and accident hazards on Duboce Avenue which is a major feeder to the freeway on-ramp at South Van Ness and carries heavy traffic volumes. As to provisions for exit, Clinton Park is a street only thirty-feet wide. If cars are parked on both sides, exiting from the site onto the street could be very difficult."

In conclusion, Mr. Passmore stated that the Commission, in approving the Code amendment to make mechanical car washes a conditional use in C-M and C-2 districts, had also adopted policy guidelines for review of such conditional use applications. Some of the factors considered in those guidelines were locational factors, such as character and function of the streets on which the car wash would be located; traffic factors, such as traffic being backed up in the streets, and the parking reservoir.

John Holly, representing Hurricane Car Washes, Inc., stated that the machines which would be installed on the subject site could handle anywhere from thirty to 120 automobiles per hour; and, given that range, he did not feel that the requirement for providing back-up space equal to one-fourth of the capacity of the machine would be valid. He advised the Commission that there are only nine automatic car washes located in San Francisco; consequently, only one car wash is available for every 41,292 vehicles registered in the City. Under the circumstances, he felt that there was no question but what additional car wash facilities are needed in San Francisco. He also remarked that the limited number of car

washing facilities presently available creates a public hazard because of the number of cars which visit those sites.

President Fleishhacker assured Mr. Holly that the Commission recognized the need for additional car wash facilities and that it was in favor of providing such facilities; however, the Commission was primarily concerned about the question of proper locations for such facilities. Noting that Mr. Holly had stated that he did not feel that the City Planning Code requirement of back-up space equal to one-fourth of the capacity of car washing machines was valid, President Fleishhacker asked him to elaborate on that point.

Mr. Holly replied that it was his opinion that washing machines with greater capacity would require lesser back-up space. If the machine which he proposed to install could accommodate up to 120 cars per hour, he doubted that there would be much need for back-up space; and, in fact, he noted that a similar facility located at North Point has provided only two back-up spaces. In conclusion, Mr. Holly stated that the subject site was the first parcel of property which he had been able to find in the past two years which would meet the City's requirement for car washes; and, therefore, he hoped that his application would be approved.

Stephen Lee, the applicant, stated that he had been to both the Department of City Planning and the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works before filing the subject application; and he had been advised verbally that no problems would be anticipated with the project. On the basis of those oral approvals, he had made down payments on the subject property and on the car washing machines. Only later had he been advised that objections had been raised to the proposal.

The Director stated that the Department of City Planning had requested comments from the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works regarding the proposed project; and he indicated that it was the letter which the City Engineer had submitted in response, as much as anything else, which had resulted in bringing the matter before the City Planning Commission for review.

Commissioner Mellon asked if it would be possible to take the matter under advisement in order to clarify the position of the Traffic Engineering Bureau. He wondered, for instance, if the Traffic Engineering Bureau had taken a traffic count in the vicinity of the subject property.

Mr. Holly doubted that the proposed use would increase the traffic in the subject neighborhood; on the contrary, the owners of the proposed car wash merely wished to take advantage of the traffic which is already in the area.

Commissioner Mellon asked if the car wash would be open for operation during peak traffic hours. Mr. Holly replied that the car wash would not be open for business until 9:00 a.m.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that the proposed use might have little affect on traffic in the area if it were operated only between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the subject application be taken under advisement indefinitely to enable the staff of the Department of City Planning to obtain additional information regarding the objections of the Bureau of Traffic Engineering.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

SECRETARY'S COPY

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY AND MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1969
100 LARKIN STREET
1:30 P. M.

PRESENT

Finn, Fleishhacker, Kearney, Mellon, Newman, Porter

1:30 P. M.

1. Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:30 p.m. to take a field trip to some of the properties scheduled for consideration during the Zoning Hearing on June 5, 1969.

ADJOURNED: 3:15 p.m.

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, May 29, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, May 29, 1969, at 2:15 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; William M. Brinton, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission

ABSENT: Commissioners James K. Carr and Thomas J. Mellon.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean R. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs; James Paul, Planner III-Housing Specialist; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Minutes of the meetings of November 7, 1968, and May 1, 8, and 22, 1969, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Michael Levine, a member of the audience, asked if any action could be taken by the Commission to protect the Old Mint from demolition should it be acquired by San Francisco State College. In response, the Commission requested the Director to determine whether any action by the Commission would be feasible and appropriate. The Director stated that he would be prepared to report to the Commission on this matter at a later date.

The Director reported on his recent trip to Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Seattle with the members of the Board of Supervisors to study new methods of transportation being used in those cities. As a result of the tour, most of the participants had decided that an extension of the BART system would provide the best form of transportation between Downtown San Francisco and the Airport; however, if the Airport Rapid Transit Station should be located in Millbrae at a considerable distance from the terminal buildings, he felt that an "air bus" similar to the one in operation in Pittsburgh might provide adequate shuttle service.

During the Commission's discussion of the transit systems which had been visited by the Director, Commissioner Brinton arrived in the meeting room and assumed his chair.

President Fleishhacker asked if any action should be taken by the Commission or if any recommendation should be made regarding the type of system which should be used to provide service between Downtown San Francisco and the Airport. The Director replied that the Commission had already adopted a Resolution favoring an extension of the BART system; and, until such time as the various monorail feasibility studies are completed and presented to the Board of Supervisors, he felt that no further action by the Commission would be necessary. In the interim, the staff of the Department of City Planning would proceed with a small-scale study to determine if it would be feasible for San Francisco itself to construct an extension of the BART system to the Airport over properties in San Mateo County which are already City-owned.

The Director distributed copies of the staff report on the Northern Waterfront Plan and advised the Commission that the reports were being mailed to members of the public that afternoon. He indicated that the text of the report was identical with the oral report which had been presented by Mr. Steele during the Commission's meeting on April 17, 1969.

The Director remarked that the Commission, at its Zoning Hearing on June 5, would consider a conditional use application requesting permission to locate a meat rendering plant on property owned by the Port Authority; and he indicated that the manufacturers of the machinery which would be used in the plant had invited a member of the South Bayshore Model Cities Agency and a member of the City Planning Commission or staff to visit a plant in Cleveland, Ohio, on Monday to view a similar plant in operation. The Commission advised the Director that a member of the staff of the Department of City Planning should be in attendance on the tour only if Departmental funds could be made available to pay for the trip.

President Fleishhacker indicated that the members of the Commission had been served with complaints filed in the International Hotel case; and he questioned whether the charges had been properly filed against the Commission in that matter. The Director stated that he would raise that question with the City Attorney's Office.

President Fleishhacker noted that various Bills had been introduced in the State Legislature concerning the conservation of San Francisco Bay; and he asked that the Commission be kept advised of the nature and status of those various Bills.

Commissioner Porter reported on the results of a committee meeting which had been held to review the findings of the staff of the Department of City Planning regarding the desirability of locating elementary schools on two sites within the Presidio, as follows:

"The staff of the Department of City Planning was requested by the Unified School District to review two locations on the Presidio as to their desirability for elementary school development. This Committee was formed to review the findings of the staff and at this time makes the following report to the Commission:

1. As the staff report indicates, the Committee feels that the Lobos Creek site on the West side of the Presidio is acceptable as designated in the Presidio Master Plan.

2. The Committee also finds the El Polin site to be acceptable for school development only as modified by the staff and only under the conditions of the design specifications noted in the staff report.

3. However, in view of the expressed concern of the community, the Committee recommends that the Lobos Creek site be developed first, especially since tentative enrollment projections indicate that an equal number of students is expected to attend each school.

4. While the staff of the Department of City Planning was asked to limit its review of the El Polin site to its acceptability for school development, the Committee feels that the wishes of the community to locate the school on another site on the Presidio should be further explored with Army officials.

5. Finally, the Committee recommends that both the Commission and the Director should continue to maintain liaison with Army Officials as in the past, offering the advice of the Department of City Planning, as appropriate, to assist in the Master Planning process for the Presidio."

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that the recommendations of the Committee be adopted as Commission policy.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Newman absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

Commissioner Porter stated that she had received a telephone call from a citizen who was concerned about new housing being constructed in the

Presidio; and, although the housing in question had already been developed far beyond the planning stage, she felt that the Commission should seek the cooperation of the Presidio officials in finding suitable locations for such projects in the future. President Fleishhacker felt that the Commissioner should be most concerned about projects which might be proposed along fringes of the Presidio adjacent to residential neighborhoods; but he did not feel that the Commission should become too involved in projects proposed for the central portions of the Presidio.

PRESENTATION OF 1968 HOUSING INVENTORY REPORT

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, and James Paul, Planner III-Housing Specialist, presented and summarized this report which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning. The report can be summarized as follows:

"1. New construction and demolition resulted in only minor net increases in the housing supply in 1968. The greatest net increase in units occurred in large apartment buildings of twenty or more units.

2. Only 1,406 housing units were added to the housing inventory in 1968. This was a slight increase over the previous year but significantly below the production level for the period 1960-1966.

3. Construction of single-family homes totaled 112 units or 8 percent of all units built in 1968. This figure represents the smallest number of single-family homes built in the 1960-1968 period.

4. The slump in new construction, which has been continuing since 1966, can be attributed to San Francisco's diminishing supply of vacant land for residential development, the concomitant costs of property acquisition and increases in the cost of construction.

5. Demolitions increased over the volumes for the last two years. There were 628 housing units demolished in 1968 compared to 523 units demolished last year and 404 in 1966.

6. Seven out of every ten units removed last year were the result of public actions. Most of these units were substandard housing in renewal areas.

7. Within San Francisco new construction and demolition activities were concentrated in certain areas of the City. The majority of districts experienced only slight changes in their housing supply.

8. All available information indicates that San Francisco is facing a severe housing shortage. The slump in new construction is likely to intensify current housing deficiencies. Both public and private actions in recent years have fallen far short of the levels of production needed to improve and expand the housing inventory."

After Commission discussion of the report, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio,
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, June 5, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, June 5, 1969, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; William M. Brinton, Virgil L. Elliott, James Finn, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Daniel Sullivan, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Cantor represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of May 15, 1969, be approved as submitted.

CU69.25 154-56 Texas Street, west line, 125 feet north of Mariposa Street. Request for continuance of an owner-occupied one-family dwelling in an M-1 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant wished to alter two flats into a single-family dwelling; and, upon completion of the alterations, the applicant intended to reside on the premises. The subject application had been filed because of a provision of the City Planning Code which allows nonconforming use dwellings in industrial districts to continue if approved by the Commission as conditional uses.

Walter P. Sherrill, Jr., the applicant, advised the Commission that five other buildings on the west side of Texas Street in the subject block are used residentially; and he noted that properties on the south side of Mariposa

Street are zoned R-3. He indicated that he wished to continue living in the subject neighborhood; and, therefore, he had filed his request for conditional use approval of continued residential use of his property.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioners Brinton and Finn arrived in the meeting room and assumed their seats at the Commission table.

President Fleishhacker inquired about the parking situation in the subject neighborhood. Mr. Sherrill replied that he had never not been able to park in front of his property.

Commissioner Newman asked if the applicant would be required to provide a garage on his property. Mr. Sherrill replied in the negative, indicating that no parking spaces would be required since the number of units in the building would be reduced. Mr. Steele confirmed that statement.

After further discussion, Mr. Steele recommended approval of the application subject to two conditions. After distributing a draft resolution and summarizing the conditions which it contained, he recommended its adoption.

Mr. Sherrill indicated that he would be willing to comply with the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6374 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

Commissioner Porter suggested that it might be desirable for the staff of the Department of City Planning to reconsider the provisions of the City Planning Code which prohibit residential uses in industrial areas. Mr. Steele replied that such a project was contemplated.

CU69.29 4027 Noriega Street, south line, 82.5 feet east of 48th Avenue.
Request for expansion of an existing nonconforming use grocery store in an R-3 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the subject property is occupied by a grocery store which was constructed in 1945 and which became a nonconforming use subject to a 1980 expiration date when the new Zoning Ordinance was adopted in 1960. In accordance with the provisions of the City Planning Code, the applicant had requested conditional use approval for an enlargement of the existing grocery store to enclose an outside storage area at the rear and side of the store without expanding the sales area. Removal of the 1980 termination date had not been requested in the subject application.

Richard Wuidner, representing the applicant, remarked that the backyard of the grocery store is an eye-sore in its present state; and he felt that the appearance of the property would be improved if the applicant were allowed to construct a storage shed to enclose the empty cartons, bottles, and boxes, which are kept in that area. Construction of the storage shed would also protect the owner of the store against having his merchandise stolen by children. In conclusion, Mr. Wuidner stated that no objection to the project had been registered by residents of the area.

Mrs. Thomas R. Best, representing the Great Highway Club, wished to make certain that the action requested of the Commission would not allow the existing building to be razed and replaced with a high-rise commercial building. President Fleishhacker assured her that approval of the subject application would allow only the specific construction project which had been proposed by the applicant; permission for any other use of the subject site would have to be requested as the subject of an entirely new conditional use or rezoning application.

Mr. Steele distributed a draft resolution of approval containing four conditions; and, after summarizing the conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. Wuidner stated that his client would be willing to comply with the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6375 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

CU69.30 1319 - 46th Avenue, west line, 100 feet south of Irving Street.
Request for a thirty-bed residential care home in an R-2 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the property is presently vacant, having formerly been occupied by a nonconforming light manufacturing and wholesaling building. The applicants had proposed to construct a rest home for thirty aged persons on the site, a rest home for the aged being considered the same as a boarding home for the aged under the provisions of the City Planning Code. In conclusion, Mr. Steele stated that the subject site, as a transitional lot, could be developed with either a boarding house with nineteen bedrooms or an apartment house with a maximum of eight dwelling units.

Mrs. Lina Breder, the applicant, stated that she presently operates a similar facility on another site; however, she hoped that the subject application would be approved so that she could expand her operation.

Mr. Fleishhacker asked about the size of the staff which would provide for the needs of the thirty occupants of the proposed rest home. Mrs. Breder replied that the facility would have a staff of four persons.

Edwin Barton, 1335 - 46th Avenue, stated that he was absolutely opposed to the subject application. He noted that the property is presently zoned R-2; and, under the circumstances, he felt that it should be devoted solely to residential usage. He stated that the subject neighborhood suffers from a serious parking problem; and he indicated that the problem had arisen because many of the single-family homes in the area had been converted into multiple dwellings. Furthermore, the problem had been complicated because of the proximity of the Surf Theatre. Under the circumstances, he felt that the applicant should be required to provide at least twelve on-site parking spaces if the subject application were to be approved.

Mr. Barton believed that the proposed rest home would resemble an "old people's hotel" in operation; and he felt that such a commercial enterprise should not be located in a residential neighborhood. He also noted that projects of the sort presently being proposed are often transferred to the jurisdiction of a church, thus being removed from the tax rolls; and, given the tax burden presently being carried by property owners in San Francisco, he was opposed to any action which might result in additional properties being exempted from taxes. He remarked that 86 pieces of property on 46th Avenue alone are posted with "for sale" signs; and he believed that many of those properties had been put on the market because of the high tax rate.

Lawrence Panattoni, 4501 Irving Street, stated that he would prefer to have the subject property used for residential purposes rather than for the operation proposed by the applicant. He remarked that parking congestion is becoming a serious problem in the neighborhood; and it was his opinion that the proposed rest home would only add to the present parking congestion in the area.

Gene Gonzalez, real estate agent for the applicants, remarked that the City Planning Code would allow construction of an eight-unit apartment building on the subject site; and, since the residents of an eight-unit apartment building might own more than sixteen automobiles, he believed that such a building would add a greater burden to parking congestion in the area than the rest home which was being proposed by his clients. In conclusion, he noted that the City Planning Commission had previously approved similar facilities in other residential districts.

Commissioner Porter asked Mr. Gonzalez if he lives in the subject neighborhood. Mr. Gonzalez replied in the negative; however, he felt that

the people who had spoken in opposition to the application were basically unfamiliar with the type of operation which Mrs. Breder proposed to conduct. He stated that Mrs. Breder is an excellent cook and that she has the ability to speak five languages. For those reasons, her services are in demand and a larger facility is needed for her operation.

Mrs. Thomas R. Best, representing the Great Highway Club, remarked that the proposed use, whether it be called a "rest home" or "convalescent hospital", would be different from the type of uses presently existing in the subject neighborhood; and she stated that the members of her organization would prefer that properties in the subject neighborhood be used for one or two-family dwellings or for small apartment buildings. She believed that the proposed building would block light and air from adjacent properties; and she felt that it would add to parking congestion in the area. Therefore, she hoped that the subject application would be disapproved.

Commissioner Porter inquired about the number of guest rooms, the number of baths, and the number of parking spaces which would be provided in the proposed building. Mr. Steele replied that the building would contain approximately nineteen rooms, most of which would house two people. Each of the rooms would have a water closet; but only two baths would be provided on each floor. Five parking spaces would be available on the site.

Commissioner Newman asked about the height of the proposed building. Mr. Steele replied that the building would have a height of 24 feet, consisting of two residential floors above a basement. If the property were developed for residential purposes under the R-2 provisions of the City Planning Code, a building with a height of forty feet would be permitted.

Mr. Wilson, a member of the San Francisco Citizens Planning Committee, stated that he was of the opinion that the City should not make any effort whatsoever to accommodate automobiles; rather, people should be encouraged to use public transportation.

Mr. Barton asked if it would be possible for the Commission to establish a stipulation that the proposed rest home should never become a nonprofit organization should it be approved by the Commission. The Director replied in the negative.

Commissioner Newman asked if Mr. Barton represented only himself. Mr. Barton replied that he represented approximately ten people from the neighborhood who were opposed to the application.

The Secretary read a letter from Manuel L. Cruz, 1751 - 46th Avenue, remarking on the need for the type of facility being proposed and suggesting that the facility would be ideally located on the subject site because of the proximity of doctors, drug stores, etc.

Commissioner Finn asked if the proposed rest home would have to meet the standards of other public agencies such as the Department of Public Health or the Department of Social Services. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative. In response to a further question from Commissioner Porter as to whether such approvals had already been obtained, Mr. Steele replied that he believed that they had.

Mr. Steele recommended approval of the application subject to four conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he submitted to the Commission for its consideration. After commenting on the conditions which he was proposing, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

President Fleishhacker, noting that one of the "Whereas" clauses of the draft resolution specified that a boarding house, having approximately the same number of residents as the proposed rest home, could occupy the subject property as a principle permitted use due to the transitional status of the property, asked for a clarification of that point. Mr. Steele confirmed that the City Planning Code would permit such a building to be constructed on the subject property if the two lots were combined as presently proposed because of the more intensive use allowed in the adjacent C-2 District.

Commissioner Porter, having reviewed the plans for the proposed facility, remarked that the applicant seemed to be aiming towards standards which were acceptable in 1950 when they should have tried to meet the standards which will prevail in 1975. She did not feel that the Commission should encourage construction of new rest homes which would place more than one person in a single room.

Mr.Gonzalez stated that twelve of the rooms in the proposed facility would be occupied by only one person. The remaining rooms would be semi-private in nature.

Mrs. Breder stated that she had no objection to the conditions which were contained in the draft resolution.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried 4 - 3 that Resolution No. 6376 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution. Commissioners Elliott, Finn, Fleishhacker, and Kearney voted "Aye"; Commissioners Brinton, Newman, and Porter voted "No".

Commissioner Porter suggested that the staff of the Department of City Planning should make certain that projects such as the one which had just been considered have been reviewed by the Department of Public Health or by other responsible public agencies before being brought to the City Planning Commission for review. Commissioner Brinton agreed and suggested that such a policy should be adopted by the Commission.

The Director agreed that difficulties might arise if the Commission should approve uses which do not subsequently merit the approval of other local agencies; however, he felt that difficulties might also arise if all such land use requests were to come before the Commission after having been approved by other licensing agencies. In his opinion, the Commission should be able to resolve questions of proper land use through reference to its own standards; and he felt that the prior approval of other agencies which are concerned with standards much different from land use, might unduly influence the decision of the Commission.

Commissioner Brinton indicated that he appreciated the Director's point of view; however, he felt that it would still be desirable for the Commission to establish a policy of requiring written statements from other City Agencies commenting upon the extent to which projects being considered by the City Planning Commission would be likely to meet their own standards.

After further discussion, the Commission asked the staff of the Department of City Planning to give further consideration to this matter and to prepare a draft resolution of policy for consideration by the Commission at a later date.

CU69.31 1652 Eddy Street, north line, 120 feet east of Pierce Street.
Request for removal of 1980 termination date for nonconforming use mortuary and for authorization to construct parking lots on both sides; in an R-3 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had requested that the existing mortuary be given conditional use status instead of its present legal nonconforming use status; and, at the same time, the applicant had specifically requested removal of the May 2, 1980, expiration date which presently applies to the use. In addition, the applicant proposed to acquire the lot to the west of the subject lot and a portion of Bourbin Street for use as parking areas to serve the mortuary. In conclusion, Mr. Steele stated that the Western Addition Redevelopment Plan indicated retention of the subject mortuary and called for the vacation of Bourbin Street in its one-block entirety.

Robert Reese, representing the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, distributed detailed maps of the subject property for review by the Commission and urged approval of the subject application.

President Fleishhacker asked if the parking area would be fenced and landscaped. Mr. Reese replied in the affirmative, indicating that the design of the fence and the landscaping would be worked out jointly by the staffs of the Department of City Planning and the Redevelopment Agency.

Eddie Mattox, owner of property in the subject neighborhood, urged that the subject application be approved.

Mr. Steele recommended approval of the application subject to four conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

Samuel Coleman, owner of the subject property, stated that he would be willing to comply with the conditions recommended by Mr. Steele.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6377 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

CU69.32 330 Fillmore Street, east line, thirty feet south of Page Street.
Request for conversion of an existing warehouse for use as a Salvation Army Red Shield Youth Center in an R-4 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which has a frontage of 150 feet on Fillmore Street and an area of approximately 18,650 square feet. He stated that the property is presently occupied by a vacant warehouse which the Salvation Army proposed to alter into a Community Youth Center.

Mr. Youngquist, representing the Salvation Army, stated that a Youth Center is presently being operated on McCoppin Street near Valencia Street. The Fillmore Street property, however, would provide almost four times as much floor space for the youth center; and it would provide a needed service for the subject neighborhood. In conclusion, he stated that other representatives of the Salvation Army were present to answer any technical questions which might be raised by members of the Commission.

Mrs. Gage, owner of property immediately adjacent to the subject site, stated that she had already experienced difficulty in obtaining adequate insurance coverage for her building; and, if the children frequenting the youth center were to damage other properties in the area, she felt that it would be impossible to obtain proper insurance coverage.

Mrs. Anthi Chamousis, property owner in the subject neighborhood, stated that young people already create a great deal of noise and disturbance in the neighborhood; and she believed that the situation would become much worse if the proposed youth center were approved. Therefore, she felt that the subject application should be disapproved.

Mr. Youngquist stated that one of the objectives of the youth center is to help youngsters become better citizens; and he indicated that only one or two minor problems had arisen during the past three years of operation of the existing youth center. He stated that the youth center would close at 9:00 P.M.; and members of his staff would go outside of the building at that time to make sure that none of the youngsters would loiter in the area. He emphasized that the youth center tries to teach its young people respect for the rights and property of others; and he felt that the proposed youth center would contribute towards making the subject area a better neighborhood.

Commissioner Porter asked how many children would participate in the activities of the center and how many staff members would be available to supervise the activities. Mr. Youngquist replied that he presently has four full-time staff people; however, he intended to increase the size of the staff if permission were granted for use of the new building. He stated that the youth center presently has a membership of 300 youngsters, although he anticipated that membership might increase to approximately 500 after the new building is in operation. Regular attendance at the center consists of thirty to fifty youngsters during the afternoons and from fifty to sixty youngsters in the evening.

Commissioner Porter then asked to what extent each activity of the youngsters is controlled. Mr. Youngquist replied that each activity within the center would have its own supervisor.

President Fleishhacker asked if all 500 members of the youth center would be likely to be on the premisis at any one time. Mr. Youngquist replied in the negative.

Commissioner Porter asked about the ages of the youngsters who would frequent the center. Mr. Youngquist replied that the ages of the youngsters would range from seven to eighteen years.

Commissioner Newman asked if the children presently using the McCoppin Street facility would be transferred to the new facility. Mr. Youngquist replied that most of the youngsters who use the McCoppin Street facility actually live in the vicinity of the Haight Street property.

President Fleishhacker asked who would assume responsibility for damage done to adjacent properties by youngsters from the youth center should such damage occur. Mr. Youngquist replied that he did not feel that such responsibility should be assumed by the Salvation Army; however, he indicated that the Salvation Army would be more than willing to work with other property owners in the neighborhood to correct any problems which might develop because of the youth center.

After further discussion, Mr. Steele submitted a draft resolution of approval which contained four conditions. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. Youngquist, having read the draft resolution, indicated that he found the conditions proposed by Mr. Steele to be acceptable.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6378 and that application No. CU69.32 be approved subject to the conditions recommended by Mr. Steele.

At 3:25 P.M. President Fleishhacker announced a five-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 3:30 P.M. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

CU69.33 330 Gavin Street, northwest corner of Boylston Street.
Request to use building previously occupied by the Skyway Baptist Church for a preschool and private elementary school for 150 pupils in an R-1 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the proposed school would have seven staff members; and he indicated that attendance at the school by children of school age would satisfy the requirements of the compulsory education laws of the State of California. Use of the site for a private elementary school would be permitted as a principle use in an R-1 District; however, since the building would also be used as a Nursery School for preschool-aged children, conditional use approval would have to be obtained from the Commission.

Frances Louise Hancock, an attorney and a member of the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Montessori School, stated that only twenty percent of the school population would consist of children younger than 4.9 years of age; and she emphasized that the subject application would not have had to be filed if the nursery school had not been included in the proposal In any case, she advised the Commission that the Skyway Baptist Church had operated a nursery school on the site for approximately the same number of children; and, therefore, the nature of the use of the proposed building would not be changed substantially and no new impact would be felt in the neighborhood.

Mrs. Hancock stated that the Montessori School Corporation has been in existence for three years; and she regarded its program as being unusually creative. The school also provides care for children of working parents before and after school hours; and, as a result, the hours of operation of the school usually run from 7:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. Not all of the children would arrive at the same time; and, because the school has a car pool arrangement, the number of automobiles making daily trips to the site would be far fewer than the number of students enrolled. No traffic problems have developed in the vicinity of the present school site; and she was confident that traffic problems would be avoided at the new site, also. She stated that remodeling plans had been prepared by an architect who is the father of one of the students enrolled in the school; and he had arranged to provide nine parking spaces for members of the school's staff.

Commissioner Porter asked if the building would be used in the evening. Mrs. Hancock replied that meetings would be held once each month for the parents; otherwise, no evening use of the building was contemplated. In that respect, the proposed use would be much less disruptive than the Skyway Baptist Church which scheduled evening activities.

Mrs. Ryan, 342 Gavin Street, stated that her property lies immediately adjacent to the subject site. She had hoped that the Skyway Baptist Church would be an attractive addition to the neighborhood; however, perhaps because of lack of funds, the building had been allowed to deteriorate. She stated that there are already a sufficient number of children in the area to wreak havoc on the neighborhood; and she was opposed to the proposed school which would bring more children to the area. In conclusion, she submitted petitions containing signatures of the residents of the subject neighborhood in opposition to the school, noting that only two individuals had expressed themselves as being in favor of the proposal.

Another resident of the subject neighborhood stated that the nursery school which had been operated by the Skyway Baptist Church had had an enrollment of only thirty or forty children. Nevertheless, a great many problems had developed; and police had had to be called on many occasions. Under the circumstances, she, also, was opposed to the subject application.

President Fleishhacker asked if either of the ladies who had spoken in opposition to the subject application could suggest a more desirable use for the subject property. Mrs. Ryan replied that she felt that the property should be used for single-family homes.

Commissioner Porter asked about the present location of the Montessori School. Mrs. Hancock replied that the school is housed in the Grace Lutheran Church at 465 Woolsey Street.

Subsequently, Commissioner Porter asked how the school had been received by residents of that area. Mrs. Hancock replied that the school's relationship with residents of the area had been quite good during its three years of operation at the Woolsey Street site.

Commissioner Brinton asked if the alteration plans which had been prepared for the building would require demolition of any portion of the building. Mrs. Hancock replied that the building would be suitable in its present form except for a few architectural details. A six-foot fence would be constructed around the site; and every effort would be made to improve the appearance of the building.

Mr. Steele recommended approval of the application subject to nine conditions which were contained in the draft resolution which he had prepared. After distributing copies ot the draft resolution to members of the Commission and summarizing the conditions, he recommended adoption of the resolution.

Mrs. Ryan advised the Committion that she had been forced to move from a house which she had previously occupied because that property had been acquired for the Southern Freeway; and she felt that it would be unfortunate if she were again forced to sell her property because of the unpleasant aspect of having a school located directly next door.

The other lady who had previously spoken in opposition to the application advised the Commission that many of the evening meetings which had been scheduled by the Skyway Baptist Church had turned out to be large parties; and she indicated that they were quite disturbing to residents of the neighborhood.

President Fleishhacker felt that the Montessori School would be much less likely to schedule that type of activity than would a church.

Commissioner Brinton remarked that he had been one of the original founders of the Urban School which is located in a residential neighborhood in Pacific Heights on property only one-third the size of the subject lot; and he indicated that few if any complaints had been received from adjacent neighbors.

Mrs. Hancock stated that most of the conditions contained in the draft resolution would be acceptable; however, she questioned the intention of Condition No. 7 which provided that "the operators of the program offered at the subject site shall be responsible for the prevention of on-street parking violations by persons coming to the subject site". She stated that the school would make every reasonable effort to control on-street parking adjacent to the subject site; however, it seemed to her somewhat unreasonable to expect the school to assume conplete responsibility for delivery trucks and other such vehicles.

The Director suggested that the portion of Condition No. 7 cited by Mrs. Hancock might be deleted.

President Fleishhacker felt that the intent of the Commission as contained in the draft resolution was clear; and he was confident that the staff of the Department of City Planning would not use its enforcement power unreasonably. Under the circumstances, he suggested that the condition should be retained in its entirety.

Commissioner Porter felt that residents of the subject neighborhood might find the subject use to be much different than they had supposed; however, if certain aspects of the use should prove to be a nuisance to residents of the area, it would be posible for the Commission to amend its conditions.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6379 and

that application No. CU69.33 be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

ZM69.15 Vacant parcel of land bounded by LeConte Avenue, Key Avenue extension, Larkspur Avenue, and land owned by the State of California; including a portion of the right-of-way of Bayview Park Road. R-1 and R-2 District

and CU69.27 Vacant parcel of land bounded by LeConte Avenue, Key Avenue extension, Larkspur Avenue, and land owned by the State of California; including a portion of the right-of-was of Bayview Park Road. Request for expansion of 300-bed convalescent hospital which was authorized in 1967 but which is still unbuilt, by the addition of another building containing ninety beds in an R-2 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Inplementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He indicated that the applicant wished to add a fourth nursing care building containing sixty beds to the 300-bed convalescent hospital complex authorized by the City Planning Commission in 1967. As originally filed, the application had requested an addition of ninety beds; however, the proposal had later been modified to involve only sixty new beds. The new building would be two floors in height and would be located on the vacant lot between LeConte and Meade Avenues, east of 963 LeConte Avenue. The main entrance to the new building would be from Meade Avenue. Since the subject property is presently zoned R-1, and since convalescent hospitals may first be authorized as a conditional use in R-2 Districts, the applicant had requested reclassification of the property to R-2. In addition, the applicant had requested that the slope areas to the east of the presently authorized convalescent hospital building be reclassified to R-2. In conclusion, Mr. Steele stated that plans for the proposed facility had been approved by the Bureau of Hospitals of the State of California.

Richard Bancroft, attorney for the applicant, stated that his client had constructed several convalescent hospitals in San Francisco. The proposed complex had been designed to be as compatible with the lay of the land in the subject area as possible; and he believed that construction of the project would improve the appearance of the subject neighborhood which has been somewhat neglected in the past. Furthermore, each of the four buildings in the complex had been designed to provide a chapel, facilities for physical and occupational therapy, and classrooms. After describing the general characteristics of the proposed buildings, he distributed floor plans which had been prepared for review by the Commission.

Mr. Bancroft noted that no other convalescent hospitals presently exist in the southeast quadrant of the City; and, therefore, he felt that

the need for the proposed facility should be clearly recognized. He advised the Commission that ten property owners in the subject neighborhood had signed a petition favoring the proposed project; and he displayed a map which indicated the location of the properties owned by those people. He stated that the proposed convalescent hospital would provide services for needy patients and would handle MediCal and MediCare patients; and he stressed that surveys which had been made by the staff of the Department of City Planning had indicated that such a facility is of the type most needed in San Francisco where many MediCal and MediCare patients have to be sent out of the city to find proper accommodations. Once completed, the proposed convalescent hospital would be operated by State-wide Convalescent Hospitals, Inc.

President Fleishhacker asked if the additional beds being requested would be necessary to make the entire project financially feasible. Mr. Bancroft replied that the additional beds would contribute to the financial feasibility of the project. More importantly, however, the additional beds would make it possible to provide additional facilities to serve the needs of the patients. He indicated that the new building would have a total of ninety beds; however, if it were approved, the number of beds proposed for the other buildings could be reduced to allow space for physical and occupational therapy activity rooms, etc. Therefore, there would be a net addition of only sixty beds to the overall complex.

Commissioner Porter remarked that overhead costs are always expensive in convalescent hospitals; and she assumed that qpproximately the same size staff would be needed for 150 patients as for 350 patients. Mr. Bancroft acknowledged that to be the case.

President Fleishhacker asked how many of the beds in the proposed facility would be reserved for MediCal and MediCare patients. Mr. Bancroft replied that as many as seventy percent of the beds might be reserved for such patients, especially since the proposed facility was intended to serve the community which surrounds it.

Mrs. Estelle, 971 LeConte Street, felt that it would be desirable to make the subject property more attractive; however, she did not feel that the proposed convalescent hospital would be an appropriate use in a neighborhood which is zoned and developed residentially. She stated that she had supported the convalescent hospital when it was first proposed as a ninety-bed facility; now, however, the applicants were requesting a total of 360 beds, she felt that the project would be much too large to be accommodated in the subject neighborhood. She also indicated that she objected to the classification of the subject neighborhood from R-1 to R-2.

The Director advised Mrs. Estelle that the application being considered by the Commission would affect only property owned by the applicant which is presently vacant; it would not involve reclassification of other properties in the area.

Mrs. Estelle asked if any assurance could be given that other properties in the area would not be rezoned at a later date. She stated that she was particularly concerned about such a possibility because of the narrowness of the streets in the neighborhood.

President Fleishhacker stated that the Commission could not promise that no further rezoning of the subject neighborhood would take place since all applications for rezoning would have to be considered on their own merits.

L.P. Lewis, Director of the Bayview Hunters Point Model Cities Agency, stated that the members of his agency had met on May 23 to consider the subject application and had decided that they would not approve the applicant's proposal to expand the convalescent hospital. That decision had been based, in part, upon the feeling that there is a greater need for a comprehensive neighborhood hospital to serve residents of the South Bayshore area than for the type of facility being proposed by the applicant. In conclusion, he stated that his Agency had also considered applications ZM69.16 and CU69.34 and had recommended that they be approved.

President Fleishhacker asked if the members of Mr. Lewis' Agency were opposed only to the proposed expansion of the convalescent hospital or to the convalescent hospital itself. Mr. Lewis replied that they were opposed only to the expansion of the facility. He also remarked that additional information had just been made available to his Agency regarding the proposal; and he stated that that information would be given further consideration.

Commissioner Porter asked if the comprehensive hospital which the Model Cities Agency felt was needed would be built privately or by the City. Mr. Lewis replied that he was not certain how the hospital might be built.

President Fleishhacker remarked that the applicant's proposal to add sixty additional beds to his convalescent hospital project would not prevent or even have any relation to the possible construction of a general hospital facility in the Bayview District.

Commissioner Newman, noting that Mr. Lewis had indicated that his agency had just received additional information regarding the subject application, asked if Mr. Lewis was requesting that the Commission defer action on the application. Mr. Lewis believed that that would be the recommendation of his agency.

Reverend D.B. Frierson, 975 LeConte Street, submitted a petition which had been signed by residents of the neighborhood in opposition to the subject application; and he advised the Commission that only three of the people with whom he had talked had indicated support of the application. He remarked that most of the children in the neighborhood play in the streets since there is no playground available for their use; and, because many of

the streets in the neighborhood now are dead-ends, they are not suited for carrying heavy traffic loads. One of the streets in the neighborhood has been barricaded to create a playground for St.Paul's Parish; and he felt that other playgrounds should be provided in the area instead of a facility such as the convalescent hospital which was presently being proposed.

President Fleishhacker noted that the petition which had been submitted by Reverend Frierson indicated that the petitioners were opposed to having their district reclassified to R-2; and he pointed out that the Commission was considering a request for reclassification of the vacant land owned by the applicant which did not involve reclassification of any other properties in the area.

Reverend Freirson stated that he understood the nature of the application; however, continued encouragement of R-2 zoning might endanger the single-family residential character of the subject neighborhood. Furthermore, if the density of the neighborhood were to be increased, the streets might have to be widened to accommodate additional traffic; and, if the streets were to be widened, present residents might have difficulty getting into their garages. He also remarked that water pressure is low in the subject neighborhood; and he felt that the large convalescent hospital project would complicate that problem. In conclusion, he remarked that there is a great deal of vacant land in the Bayview District; and he suggested that the proposed convalescent hospital might be better located on another site.

Mr. Eagle stated that he was not a resident of the subject neighborhood; however, he wished to ask whether the proposed expansion would be necessary to make the convalescent hospital economically feasible or if the expansion would merely improve the financial situation of the applicant. If a smaller development would be economically feasible, he wondered if the City Planning Commission would endorse the use of a portion of the subject site for a mini-park.

The Director stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had not been primarily concerned with the economic feasibility of the proposed project; rather, the staff had been concerned about the nature of the use proposed and its probable impact on the adjacent neighborhood. With regard to the question raised by Mr. Eagle, he stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended three or four miniparks in the Bayview Area; however, the subject property had not been designated for such a purpose. With regard to the comprehensive neighborhood hospital mentioned by Mr. Lewis, he remarked that the South Bayshore Plan which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended the construction of such a facility. He emphasized, however, that the convalescent hospital presently under consideration was not in any way related to the other proposal.

Mr. Steele recommended that both the request for reclassification and the request for expansion of the convalescent hospital be approved. In approving the conditional use application for expansion of the convalescent

hospital, he recommended that the Commission establish three conditions which he had included in a draft resolution which had been placed before the Commission for consideration.

Reverend Frierson asked if the applicants intended to widen any streets in the subject neighborhood. Mr. Bancroft replied that his client neither had the authority nor the intention of undertaking such a project. In any case, access to the convalescent hospital would be obtained from the Freeway and Meade Avenue and not from LeConte Street.

Reverend Frierson, noting that his property immediately abuts the subject site, asked if the applicant would construct a retaining wall behind his garden. Mr. Bancroft replied that he was confident that his client would do more than meet his legal obligations.

Paul Comer, representing the owners of the parcel of property located on the north side of LeConte Street, spoke in favor of the applicant's request for reclassification and expansion of the convalescent hospital. He stated that the vacant property owned by the applicant is in a disgraceful condition at the present time; and he felt that construction of the proposed project would improve the appearance of the neighborhood.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution 6380 be adopted and that Application ZM69.15 be approved.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6381 be adopted and that Application CU69.27 be approved subject to the three conditions contained in the draft resolution.

ZM69.16 1364-78 Underwood Avenue, north line, 100 feet east of Jennings Street. M-1 to an R-1 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the parcel has a frontage of 125 feet on Underwood Avenue and a uniform depth of 100 feet. The parcel consists of three separate lots which are occupied by three buildings containing a total of four dwelling units. Mr. Steele stated that the proposal had been presented to the Bayview-Hunters Point Model Neighborhood Agency for review; and he noted that Mr. Lewis, speaking earlier in the afternoon, had indicated that his agency had approved the applicant's request.

President Fleishhacker, noting that only a few people in the audience were interested in the subject application, asked Mr. Steele to make his recommendation before receiving comments from the floor.

Mr. Steele noted that the subject property, which is currently occupied by dwellings, abuts property zoned R-1 on the north and west; and he indicated that the proposed reclassification would constitute an expansion of the existing R-1 District. He felt that there is a need for the retention and upgrading of existing dwellings in the subject portion of the City; and he believed that need to be adversely affected in the subject case by the M-1 zoning of the subject dwellings which would require their termination in 1980. In his opinion, the subject property would not be needed for industrial purposes;

and continued residential occupancy of the property would not adversely affect existing or future industrial activities to the west and south. Therefore, he recommended that the subject application be approved.

No one in the audience wished to speak in opposition to Mr. Steele's recommendation.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Elliott, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6382 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

CU69.34 Port Authority land, 1860 feet east of Third Street and 504 feet south of Islais Street.
Request for a plant for the rendering or reduction of fat, bones, or other animal material in an M-1 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicants presently operate a rendering plant in the Butchertown Redevelopment Project area; and, with the approval of the Commission, they hoped to relocate their facility to the subject site. He stated that the applicant's proposal had been presented to the Bayview-Hunters Point Model Neighborhood Agency for review; and representatives of that agency had visited a similar facility in Cleveland, Ohio, to determine whether such a facility might be offensive if it were to be located on the subject site. Mr. Lewis, representing the Model Cities Agency, had appeared before the Commission earlier in the afternoon to indicate that his Agency had recommended approval of the subject application.

Peter Bank, structural engineer for the Royal Tallow Company, stated that he had read a copy of the draft resolution of approval which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning. His firm had found the conditions contained in the draft resolution to be acceptable; and they hoped that the Resolution would be adopted by the Commission.

The Director informed the Commission that the staff had advised the applicant that a recommendation of approval would be likely unless new information of an important nature were uncovered during the course of the public hearing; and, at the same time, the staff had advised the applicant of the type of requirements which might be established to govern the operation of the meat rendering plant should it be approved.

Commissioner Porter asked if the project had been approved by the Port Commission. The Director replied in the affirmative, emphasizing that the subject property is actually owned by the Port Commission.

Dave Jenkins, representing one of the locals of the Longshoremen's Union, advised the Commission that representatives of all of San Francisco's Maritime Unions had met with Mayor Alioto last week to discuss changes which might be made in the Port as a result of its acquisition by the City. At

the end of that meeting, the Mayor suggested that another meeting of the same group be scheduled in six weeks. During the interim, representatives of the Union wished to meet with the Port Commissioners and with the City Planning Commission to determine what plans are being made for the future expansion of the Port. Under the circumstances, he thought that it would be desirable if the Commission would postpone its decision on the subject application.

President Fleishhacker asked if Mr. Jenkins' Union was opposed to the facility being requested by the applicant. Mr. Jenkins replied that his Union might be opposed to the application unless it could be determined that the proposed project is part of a plan in which the Longshoremen are involved in a positive way. Having worked with animal hides, he knew that they do have a bad odor; and if the odors from the meat rendering plant were to be directed toward the sea where the Longshoremen will be working, he felt that it might be undesirable. Furthermore, the meat rendering plant would be located on property which might otherwise be used for expansion of the Port. He felt that San Francisco's 22,000 Longshoremen had a right to be kept informed on matters affecting the Port; and, until such time as they are better informed, it would be difficult to evaluate proposals such as the one presently being considered by the Commission.

Commissioner Porter noted that Commissioner Kearney had served for several years on the Commission's Northern Waterfront Committee; and, as president of the Longshoremen's Union, she felt that he had been in a good position to maintain liaison with the Longshoremen. She indicated that she sympathized with Mr. Jenkins' apparent desire to have all of the property owned by the Port dedicated exclusively to shipping; however, whe believed that the Port might have very good reasons for releasing some of its property for other uses.

The Director stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had been concerned about performance standards for the proposed use and about the desirability of locating such a facility on the subject property. Finally, however, the staff had determined that location of the use on the subject property would be consistent with the Port's over-all plans for the area since the Port's new containerization facilities would not be affected by the small parcel of property in question. Having reached that determination, the staff had then proceeded to prepare performance standards for the use which were spelled out in the draft resolution of approval which had been referred to by Mr. Bank.

Commissioner Kearney believed that Mr. Jenkins was not necessarily opposed to the subject application; rather, he was concerned about the fact that many people working on the waterfront had not been informed of plans which are being developed for the waterfront area. He remarked that the Commission had received a telegram from the Potrero Boosters requesting that decision on the subject application be postponed. In view of that request, and in view of Mr. Jenkins' concern, he thought that the Commission should take the application under advisement for at least thirty days upon conclusion of the present hearing.

For the Commission's information, the Director submitted copies of the draft resolution of approval which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning, calling attention to the thirteen conditions which were intended to establish performance standards for the proposed use. He noted that the Bayview-Hunters Point Model City Agency had recommended approval of the application after members of that agency had visited a similar facility in Cleveland, Ohio, earlier in the week. The Director also advised the Commission that the staff of the Department of City Planning had telephoned the Planning Departments in both Cleveland, Ohio, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; neither department had had anything unfavorable to report about the meat rendering plants located in their cities. The Director summarized the thirteen conditions which were contained in the draft resolution, noting that Condition No. 13 provided that procedures for controlling the emission of odors from the proposed plant would be reviewed by the Department of City Planning after the plant had been in operation for five years. He stated that he was convinced that the proposed conditions would prevent the plant from being obnoxious; however, because of rapid technological change, he felt that it would be desirable to review the operation at the end of a five-year period.

Commissioner Newman asked if any flame would be visible from the exterior of the building. The Director replied in the negative.

Commissioner Brinton asked what would happen to the water which would be condensed from steam used in the facility. Mr. Passmore replied that such water would have no odor.

Mrs. Elaine Sundahl, representing the Potrero Hill Residents and Home Owners' Council, stated that none of the members of her organization had had an opportunity to visit the new meat rendering plant in Cleveland, Ohio; however, she indicated that the members of her organization do have strong feelings against the type of meat rendering plants which presently exist in San Francisco. Under the circumstances, she wondered if the members of her organization would have an opportunity to obtain more information regarding the type of equipment which would be used in the new plant.

President Fleishhacker stated that the primary purpose of taking the subject application under advisement would be to enable groups such as the Potrero Hill Merchants, Residents and Home Owners' Council to meet with the staff of the Department of City Planning to obtain more information regarding the meat rendering plant. He also suggested that Mrs. Sundahl's group might want to meet with the Bayview-Hunters Point Model Cities Agency since representatives of that Agency had had an opportunity to visit a similar plant in Cleveland.

Mr. Ostler, a resident of Potrero Hill, stated that he had purchased his home approximately a year ago; and only after he had moved into the house had he become aware of the terribly acrid odors which apparently emanate from the existing meat rendering plants in Butchertown. Given the number of industrial plants which already pollute the atmosphere, he felt that it would hardly be fair of the Commission to approve construction of another plant of that type.

President Fleishhacker pointed out that the applicants wished to relocate an existing plant to a new site and to install new equipment which would eliminate objectionable odors. In any case, he assured Mr. Ostler that the Commission joined him in not wishing to perpetuate existing conditions in the meat rendering plants.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the subject application be taken under advisement until the meeting of July 3, 1969.

Mr. McCallum, also representing the applicants, felt that the one-month delay would create a financial hardship for his firm. He stated that his firm was willing to conform to the standards which had been proposed by the staff of the Department of City Planning; and the new equipment which would meet those standards had already been ordered. If approval by the Commission were to be delayed, the new equipment would have to be placed in storage. He stated that a lease agreement had already been signed with the Port Commission; and that the Commission had indicated that it would have the final authority in the matter. Nevertheless, his firm had felt that it would be desirable to bring the proposal before the City Planning Commission for review.

Mr. Bank noted that the members of the Model Cities Agency, who would be more affected by the proposed installation than the residents of Potrero Hill, had already approved the proposal. With regard to the concerns voiced by Mr. Jenkins, he reported that the Port Authority had planned to use the subject site for a meat rendering plant since 1964.

President Fleishhacker believed that the subject application involved matters which would be of interest to all residents of San Francisco and not just the residents of a particular neighborhood; and, under the circumstances, he felt that it would be desirable to take the application under advisement so that information regarding the proposal could be made available to all individuals who are interested.

In that regard, Commissioner Kearney requested that the staff of the Department of City Planning assume responsibility for arranging meetings with residents of Potrero Hill and with representatives of the Longshoremen's Union.

Commissioner Newman requested that written statements be obtained both from the Port Authority and from the Bayview-Hunters Point Model Cities Agency regarding the subject application.

The Director, remarking on the limited resources of the staff of the Department of City Planning, suggested that it might be more desirable for the Longshoremen's Union to make arrangements directly with the Port Commission regarding meetings to discuss future plans for the waterfront south of China Basin; he indicated, however, that the staff would be more than

willing to meet with any interested groups regarding plans for the Northern Waterfront area which had been prepared by the Department of City Planning [illegible] cooperation of the Port Commission.

After further discussion, the question was called and the Commission voted unanimously to take the subject application under advisement until the meeting of July 3, 1969.

CU69.35 Safeway Store, 4940 Mission Street, west line, through to Alemany Boulevard; 544 feet south of Onondaga Avenue. Request for an access driveway to an existing parking lot through an R-1 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant proposed to construct a driveway 25 feet wide to provide access and egress from Alemany Boulevard and to eliminate vehicular access and egress from Bertita Street. Conditional use authorization would be required to modify stipulations adopted in Resolution No. 3774 to prohibit vehicular access from Alemany Boulevard when the subject property was reclassified from second residential to commercial in 1950 to allow construction of the existing store. Conditional use authorization would also be required to allow an access driveway across residentially zoned property to commercially zoned property.

P. J. Davidson, representing the Realty Department of Safeway Stores, Inc., emphasized that granting of the subject application would relieve traffic congestion on Bertita Street which is a narrow residential street leading into the Safeway Parking lot from the south. If the access were to be allowed from Alemany Boulevard, the vehicular access from Bertita Street would be closed. Furthermore, if access were granted from Alemany Boulevard, problems would be alleviated which are now caused by people traveling north on Alemany Boulevard who can see the parking lot but who cannot find a way into it; as circumstances now stand those people must go around the block, adding further congestion to Mission Street, to gain access to the parking lot. In conclusion, he stated that no left-turn problem should develop if access were granted from Alemany Boulevard since the existing center strip would prohibit such maneuvers.

H. L. Klunig, 2040 Alemany Boulevard, advised the Commission that [illegible] presently a pedestrian access to the Safeway market from Alemany [illegible]; and, since vehicular access is already allowed from Mission Street [illegible] from Bertita Street, he saw no reason for approving the subject application. [illegible] case, Safeway had always done without such access; and he felt that [illegible] of the same circumstances should not inconvenience the market. [illegible] conclusion, he stated that provision of access from Alemany Boulevard would [illegible]ably increase truck traffic on the street; and the residents of Alemany Boulevard would object if that were the case.

Mrs. Gimmarusti, 1915 Alemany Boulevard, stated that many of [illegible]'s customers presently park on Alemany Boulevard and walk into the [illegible]d, if vehicular access to the parking lot were allowed from Alemany B[illegible], she felt that property owners on the east side of Alemany Boulevard w[illegible]ind it even more difficult to get into their garages. Furthermore, if vehicular access from Alemany were granted to Safeway, she believed that other businesses, such as the nearby funeral parlor, would want the same privilege. In conclusion, she stated that she had purchased her property in 1940 with the understanding that no commercial uses would be allowed to have access from Alemany Boulevard.

William White, president of the Alemany District Council and Improvement Club, advised the Commission that his organization was opposed to the granting of the subject application. He noted that Alemany Boulevard is developed residentially; and residents of the area had always opposed requests for vehicular access to commercial properties from Alemany Boulevard. If the subject application were to be approved, he was certain that other businesses fronting on Mission Street would request access from Alemany Boulevard, also. In addition to having a damaging affecton the value of R-1 properties along Alemany Boulevard, the opening up of driveways to commercial properties from Alemany Boulevard would create a dangerous traffic situation. He noted that Safeway had originally been willing to construct a store on the subject site with the understanding that access would not be allowed from Alemany Boulevard; yet, although all access from Alemany Boulevard was prohibited, Safeway had installed a gate to allow pedestrian access to their site. Under the circumstances, he did not feel the Commission should be obliged to grant the Safeway Store a privilege which the store had never had any right to expect that it could obtain.

Rose M. White, also representing the Alemany District Council and Improvement Club, submitted a petition which she had obtained from residents of the subject neighborhood in opposition to the subject application. Although the volume of traffic on Alemany Boulevard was supposed to have been reduced because of the construction of the Southern Freeway, the street still carries a heavy traffic load, particularly when traffic on the Freeway becomes snarled. On the preceding Monday night, three accidents had occurred within three blocks of the Safeway store; and she believed that traffic would become much more hazardous if the store were allowed to have access from Alemany Boulevard. She remarked that Safeway had been satisfied to build a s[illegible] on the site without access from Alemany Boulevard; and, from all indica[illegible] the store had done a good business. Consequently, she saw no justifica[illegible] the change which was being requested.

Another resident of the neighborhood agreed with Mrs. White. He f[illegible]hat access to the Safeway site is adequately provided for by the existing [illegible]lar driveways from Mission Street and Bertita Streetand by the pedestrian [illegible] from Alemany Boulevard. Furthermore, if the Bertita Street access were [illegible]ed, he believed that residents of that street would be angry because the street would then become a dead-end.

Mr. Steele believed that the opening of the Southern Freeway had substantially reduced the traffic volume on Alemany Boulevard in the subject vicinity; and he felt that provision of vehicular access to the Safeway parking lot would not add to the traffic on Alemany Boulevard. In fact, provision of access from Alemany Boulevard would have the desirable effect of reducing traffic on adjoining streets leading to the existing parking lot. Finally, he noted that the closing of Bertita Street to automobile and truck traffic generated by the Safeway store would be extremely beneficial to the residential quality of that street. Therefore, he recommended approval of the application subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

Commissioner Porter noted that the members of the Commission had made a field trip to the subject site. At that time, it had seemed that provision of vehicular access from Alemany Boulevard to the Safeway parking lot would not place a hardship on the surrounding neighborhood. However, if the subject application were approved, she felt that it might be difficult for the Commission to deny such access to other commercial operations fronting on Mission Street.

Mr. Steele indicated that he was of the opinion that Safeway's situation was somewhat unique and that no comparable situation exists along Alemany Boulevard; and he emphasized that the closing of the Bertita Street access to the parking lot would benefit the residential character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Porter asked if delivery trucks would be authorized to use the new vehicular access from Alemany Boulevard. Mr. Steele replied that the draft resolution would not prohibit use of the driveway by delivery trucks.

A member of the audience noted that the proposed driveway would have a width of only 25 feet; and he remarked that the driveway would be much too narrow to accommodate trucks which need a wide turning radius. In any case, he fully expected that Safeway would soon request permission to widen the driveway if the subject application were approved.

Commissioner Finn remarked that he had previously suggested that the proposal should be discussed with the interdepartmental staff committee on traffic and transportation; and he wondered if that committee had made a recommendation regarding the proposal. Mr. Steele replied that the proposal had not been reviewed by ISCOTT; however, the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works had recommended approval of the application.

President Fleishhacker asked if the applicants did contemplate filing a subsequent request for widening of the driveway. Mr. Davidson replied in the negative, indicating that the store would be satisfied with a 25-foot-wide driveway.

President Fleishhacker then asked if the driveway would be used by delivery trucks. Mr. Davidson replied that the driveway was intended to serve people who now park their automobiles on Alemany Boulevard and walk into the store; and, under the circumstances, his firm would not object to a condition which would prohibit the use of the driveway by delivery trucks.

Commissioner Kearney noted that the Safeway store had been without automobile access from Alemany Boulevard for a number of years; and he saw no reason for changing the situation at the present time, especially since such an action on the part of the Commission would set a precedent for approving similar requests in the future. Therefore, he moved that the subject application be disapproved. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brinton.

Commissioner Finn stated that he intended to vote against the application since no recommendation had been obtained from the Police Department regarding the proposal.

After further discussion the question was called and the Commission voted 6-1 to adopt Resolution No. 6383 and to disapprove the subject application. Commissioners Brinton, Elliott, Finn, Kearney, Newman, and Porter voted "Aye"; Commissioner Fleishhacker voted "No".

CU69.36 232-38 San Jose Avenue, west line, 167 feet south of 24th Street. Request for conversion of existing building to professional offices for the Mission Community Mental Health Center in an R-4 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the Mission Mental Health Center, an agency of the San Francisco Department of Public Health, had requested conditional use authorization for a mental health day care center and half-way house in the building which presently exists on the subject site. He indicated that approximately eleven off-street parking spaces are available in the rear of the subject building with access from San Jose Avenue along the side of the building.

Dr. David Shupp, Director of the Mission Mental Health Center, advised the Commission that the operation of the proposed facility would more closely represent a day care center than an ordinary medical office building. Patients would visit the center two or three times a week; and they would stay for a considerable amount of time on those days. Therefore, the proposed facility would not generate nearly so much traffic as an ordinary medical office building. The third floor of the building would be used as a "half-way house" for patients who are not yet ready for independent living. Occupational therapy would be provided on the premises according to the needs of the patients.

President Fleishhacker asked about the number of people who might be using the proposed facility. Dr. Shupp replied that the day care center would handle a maximum of thirty patients at one time. The residential section of the building would accommodate a maximum of only fifteen patients.

President Fleishhacker asked why the subject application had come before the Commission in the form of a conditional use application rather than in the form of a referral. Mr. Steele replied that the subject property is not owned by the City but by a private individual.

Mrs. Barbara Champion, representing the Eureka Valley Promotion Association, urged that the subject application be approved. She thought that the proposed facility is needed; and she believed that it would blend harmoniously with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mrs. Maxwell, chairman of the Health and Recreation Committee of the Mission Coalition, also urged that the subject application be approved. She stated that her organization had worked closely with the Mission Mental Health Center; and she remarked that there are not many buildings available in the Mission District which would be suitable for such a use.

Dr. Charles Clay, director of Conard House which is located at 2441 Jackson Street between Fillmore and Steiner Streets, stated that his organization had been in operation for the past ten years in a residential neighborhood; and, during that time, they had maintained a good relationship with their neighbors. He stated that half-way houses serve a useful social function in that they make it possible for many patients to be discharged from hospitals at an earlier date than would otherwise be the case. In conclusion, he stated that most of the patients of Conard House are employed in the community.

President Fleishhacker asked if Conard House is similar to the type of facility which was presently being proposed by the Mission Mental Health Center. Mr. Clay replied that Conard House is a half-way center; and, as such, it is similar to the half-way house which was being proposed for the third floor of the subject building.

Commissioner Newman asked if the proposed center would be a new facility or if it would merely replace an existing facility. Dr. Shupp replied that the facility would provide a new service which would be funded by a Federal grant. The Mission Mental Health Service office at San Francisco General Hospital provides only emergency service and outpatient care.

George Kardum, 210 San Jose Avenue, stated that he opposed the subject application because of the affect which the proposed facility would have on parking congestion in the neighborhood. Although both the Eureka Valley Promotion Association and the Mission Coalition had spoken in favor of the aplication, he noted that both groups represent people who do not live in the

subject neighborhood; and he indicated that he had collected signatures from approximately 150 property owners and tenants from the subject neighborhood in opposition to the application. He remarked that San Francisco General Hospital is located within a short distance of the subject site; and he felt that the proposed mental health center should be located within that complex instead of on the subject property.

President Fleishhacker pointed out that the proposed service is not now offered at San Francisco General Hospital.

Commissioner Porter asked if emergency cases would be handled on the subject site. Dr. Shupp replied in the negative.

Mr. Kardum advised the Commission that the people presently living in the subject building are most undesirable; and he indicated music is played on the premisis at all hours of the night.

Mr. Zimmerlin, 1281 Guererro Street, described the subject neighborhood as one of the prettiest areas in the Mission District; and he did not feel that the proposed use would be a desirable addition to the neighborhood. He stated that he is a real estate broker; and he beleived that approval of the proposed use would lessen the econimic value of adjacent property. Furthermore, the subject neighborhood, as presently constituted, is a nice area for small children; and, therefore, not the best possible location for a mental health center.

John Lank represented his mother who owns property at 228-37 San Jose Avenue. He regarded the proposed mental health center as being nothing more than a medical office building; and, as such, he felt that it would create a terrible traffic problem in the subject neighborhood. He pointed out that the neighborhood is a quiet residentialarea without any commercial uses such as the one presently being proposed; and he felt that the residential character should be retained. In conclusion, he stated that he was vehemently opposed to the subject application.

President Fleishhacker asked members of the audience who were opposed to the subject application to raise their hands. Many responded.

A member of the audience identified himself as the real estate agent for the apartment house located at 260 San Jose Avenue. He stated that the apartment house has 26 units, many of which are occupied by retired people; and he indicated that they were opposed to the proposed use of the subject site.

Commissioner Brinton asked if he were correct in his understanding that no new construction would take place on the subject site if the application were approved. Dr. Shupp replied in the affirmative, indicating that only remodeling of the existing building was being contemplated.

Dr. Eugene Eagle, owner of the subject property, advised the Commission that 38 people reside in the subject building at the present time. The people are young; and they tend to bring a great many visitors to the site. The building has a lounge for entertaining; and, in addition, a shed-type

building on the lot is leased as a studio for two rock and roll groups which often practice untill 1:00 or 2:00 A.M. He was certain that the proposed use would be much quieter and much less disruptive than the present use of the site; and he was confident that the eleven off-street parking spaces and three curb spaces available for the property would be sufficient to serve the mental health center. In conclusion, he pointed out that the people who would live on the site if the subject application were approved would have constant medical supervision; and, to that extent, they would probably create less of a nuisance than the people who are presently living in the building, most of whom are "hippies".

A lady from the audience felt that the constant coming and going of people which would be a characteristic of the mental health center would be undesirable in the subject neighborhood; and she felt that the proposed facility would be better located at 24th and Valencia Streets.

Another resident of the neighborhood felt that the owner of the subject property was a speculator who was attempting to pacify residents of the area by offering them a use which would be slightly better than the one to which the property is presently devoted; but he felt that the property should be required to revert to family residential use.

Andrew Hickson, 1243 Guererro Street, agreed with the previous speaker. He stated that he had lived in the subject neighborhood for twelve years and that the subject building had posed no problems for the neighborhood until one and a half years ago.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application be disapproved. He noted that the subject property is located on a street which is entirely residential in development and character; and he remarked that the proposed mental health center would be sufficiently non-residential in character to cause a blighting effect on the area. Furthermore, the use would generate a significant amount of non-local vahicular and pedestrian traffic which would be detrimental to the residential character of the neighbornood.

Dr. Clay emphasized that Conard House itself is located in an exclusively residential area; and, since the house next door had recently been valued at $175,000, he felt that it was obvious that his facility had not lowered property values in the area. He stated that Conard House screens its applicants very carefully to "weed out" individuals who might create problems; and, assuming that the Mission Mental Health Center would do the same, he felt that the subject neighborhood might experience fewer problems with the proposed use than with the present occupants of the building. He advised the Commission that most of the people who would be using the proposed facility would not be wealthy enough to afford automobiles; and, therefore, they should not contribute substantially to traffic congestion in the area. Most importantly, however, he felt that mental patients should be housed in a residential community as opposed to a commercial area since at least one-half of the therapeutic effect of half-way centers comes from such surroundings; and, in that respect, he felt that the subject site was ideally located for the proposed use.

President Fleishhacker asked if he were correct in understanding that the entire building could be used as "half-way house" without special authorization by the Commission if the subject application were to be disapproved. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative, indicating that the subject application had been filed only because the day-care center would require conditional use authorization.

Commissioner Brinton moved that the subject application be taken under advisement to allow the staff of the Department of City Planning to formulate conditions which could be established by the Commission in approving the application at a later date. That motion failed for want of a second.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried five to two that Resolution No. 6384 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved. Commissioners Elliott, Finn, Kearney, Newman, and Porter voted aye; Commissioners Brinton and Fleishhacker voted no.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, June 12, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, June 12, 1969, at 2:15 P.M. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; William M. Brinton, Thomas J. Mellon, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: James K. Carr, member.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Marie Carlberg, Planner III; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Brinton and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of May 29, 1969, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that he and Commissioner Mellon had just returned from Sacramento where they had attended a meeting to discuss transportation issues.

The Director advised the Commission that he had been invited to attend a Center City Transportation Project seminar sponsored by Urban America in Shawnee-on-Delaware on June 25-27. He indicated that he did not intend to attend the seminar.

The Director reported that a committee of the Commission had met with an official of the Presidio to discuss new developments being contemplated by the Army. As a result of the meeting, those present had agreed that a public meeting should be held by the City Planning Commission to present all plans which have been developed for the Presidio. Following that meeting, the Department of City Planning would try to work with the Army to resolve any problems which might become apparent. A letter is expected from the Presidio endorsing such an approach.

The Director reported that the staff of the Department of City Planning had submitted material to the Mayor's Office for the Workable Program

Report. However, because of difficulties being faced in meeting the requirements of the Federal Government's new questionnaire, recertification of the program would be delayed.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF MECHANICAL CARWASH PROPOSED FOR SOUTHEAST CORNER OF DUBOCE AVENUE AND VALENCIA STREET IN A C-M ZONING DISTRICT
(Under Advisement from meeting of May 15, 1969)

The Director remarked that this matter had been discussed during the Commission's meeting on May 15; and he indicated that he had recommended disapproval of the application at that time because of the effect which the proposed facility would have on traffic in the immediate area. However, the matter had been taken under advisement by the Commission so that further comments could be received from the Bureau of Traffic Engineering of the Department of Public Works regarding their recommendation that the application be disapproved.

President Fleishhacker recalled that the applicant had advised the Commission that the Traffic Engineering Bureau had first indicated that the project would be approved; however, when final plans were submitted, the City Engineer, on the recommendation of the Traffic Engineering Bureau, had written a letter recommending denial of the application.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, repeated his description of the project proposed by the applicant. In conclusion, he noted that the subject property is located at an extremely busy intersection; and, because of the "L" shaped nature of the lot and the layout of the machinery that it would require, he felt that the proposed use would result in the backing up of traffic on both Valencia and Duboce Streets, thus creating a traffic hazard.

Richard Evans, representing the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works, stated that he had never advised the applicant that the project would be approved; and he indicated that his bureau has relatively strong feelings regarding car wash proposals. After reviewing plans for the project, they had written a letter on April 30 recommending denial of the application.

President Fleishhacker asked if people are in the habit of coming to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering for the purpose of asking informal questions Mr. Evans replied that it is possible for people to raise informal questions on the telephone; however, no one on his staff is authorized to approve or disapprove projects as the result of such conversations.

Mr. Passmore stated that the Traffic Engineering Bureau had seen rough sketches of the proposed projects some time ago; and, that time, they had indicated that they did not foresee any problems with the projects. However, they indicated that final decision would have to be based on more detailed drawings.

Steven Lee, the applicant, displayed the drawings which he had shown to the Traffic Engineering Bureau and to the Department of City Planning last September; and he remarked that the drawings were clear enough that they should have been understandable. In any case, both of the departments involved had indicated at that time that they envisioned no problems with the proposal.

Mr. Evans advised the Commission that the Traffic Engineering Bureau had made a study of car washes approximately eight months ago; and, on the basis of the information obtained from that study, they had recommended disapproval of the subject application.

Commissioner Porter asked if the Traffic Engineering Bureau were inclined to disapprove of all new car washes. Mr. Evans replied in the negative, indicating that his bureau might recommend approval of new car washes if adequate resevoir space were to be provided.

David Silva, attorney for Hurricane Car Washes, Inc. felt that the Commission might not have a full understanding of the equipment which would be used on the subject property since no comparable equipment is being used in San Francisco at the present time. Customers coming to the property would have to purchase a certain amount of gas in exchange for a free car wash; and the wash itself would clean only the outside surfaces of the automobile. There would be no drying area; and, consequently, the automobile would be on its way immediately after leaving the washing machine. The capacity of the washing machine could be adjusted to accommodate anywhere from 40 to 80 automobiles an hour; and, if it were set to accommodate 80 automobiles an hour, no stacking problems should arise. In any case, he believed that any problems posed by the proposed facility could be overcome if the staff of the Department of City Planning would be willing to work further with the applicant to modify certain aspects of the proposal. He felt that it would be possible to realign the equipment of the lot and to redesign the curb cuts proposed for the site. In addition, it might be possible to establish a no-parking zone on one side of Clinton Park to minimize any traffic congestion which might develop on that street.

The Director stated that he would be prepared to recommend that the subject application be continued under advisement if such an arrangement would be acceptable to both the applicant and to Mr. Evans.

Mr. Lee stated that he would prefer that the Commission reach a decision during the present meeting based on the merits of the proposal as presented.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the permit application be disapproved.

R69.24 Vacation of a portion of Merchant Street between Sansome and Montgomery Streets for Transamerica Building.

President Fleishhacker stated that he had received a letter from Sidney E. Roberts, attorney for the Transamerica Corporation, requesting that consideration of the street vacation request be postponed until the Commission's meeting on June 26, when it could be considered jointly with the Commission's discretionary review of the building permit application for the proposed building.

The Director stated that he did not object to the applicant's request for postponement; however, since plans for the proposed building had not yet been received in the offices of the Department of City Planning, he could not guarantee that the staff would be prepared to schedule Commission review of those plans on June 26.

Commissioner Kearney asked if the request for postponement were contingent upon a guarantee that the matter could be heard on June 26. James Haynes, also representing the Transamerica Corporation, stated that plans for the proposed building would be filed with the Department of City Planning on June 16; and his firm had understood that the meeting of that deadline would give the staff of the Department of City Planning ample time to review the proposal before the meeting of June 26. In any case, the applicants were not prepared to make a presentation during the present meeting.

Commissioner Brinton remarked that it would take the staff of the Department of City Planning a considerable amount of time to review plans for a project of the magnitude of the one being proposed; and, under the circumstances, he wondered if the plans for the building would actually be filed on the 16th.of June. Mr. Haynes replied that his firm had a "firm expectation" of filing the plans on that date.

Commissioner Brinton suggested that it might be better for the Commission to accept July 10 as the definite date for consideration of the plans instead of being indefinite about a possible hearing on June 26.

Mr. Haynes stated that his firm would prefer to aim towards a hearing on June 26 instead of counting on a definite July 10 date.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that hearing of application R69.24 be postponed with the understanding that the staff of the Department of City Planning would try to place the matter on calendar again on June 26, 1969.

R69.27 Vacation of portions of Michigan and Fourth Streets.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

East of Illinois Street, Fourth and Michigan Streets serve the Santa Fe's China Basin terminal facilities almost exclusively. The fee to these streets if owned by the port commission which has jurisdiction over the area; the City holds easement rights. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company and the Santa Fe Land Improvement Company have petitioned for the vacation; they and the Port Commission are the abutting owners.

The proposed vacations consist of a portion of Fourth Street approximately 178 feet long northwesterly of its connection with Michigan Street, and Michigan Street between Fourth and El Dorado Streets, some 1,000 feet long. These streets do not serve the general public. The tenants of the Port Commission who might now use them could be served cia 16th, Illinois and El Dorado Streets.

The street areas would be vacated to the Port Commission and then leased to the Santa Fe which wishes to relocate some of its facilities and construct a modern, jajor terminal warehouse over the greater part of Michigan Street.

Most of the streets within the China Basin area have already been vacated. China Basin Street and Mission Rock Street provide public access to the waterfront but are not dedicated streets; the Port Commission prefers to be able to relocate them without going through the vacation procedure.

The Fire Department has expressed an objection to the proposed vacation because of the location of some of its hydrants and because its access through the area would be restricted. There is a fire house at the southeast corner of Third and Fourth Streets. A water line in Michigan Street will have to be relocated if the street is vacated.

Joseph S. Rogers, attorney for the Santa Fe Land Improvement Company, stated that he had met with Assistant Chief Emmett Condon of the San Francisco Fire Department and had assured him that provision would be made for adequate access to the site. Because of the cost of the new building being proposed and because of the value of the merchandise which it might house, his clients were as concerned about adequate fire protection as was the Fire Department. He stated that his clients had also agreed to relocate existing fire hydrants in the area and to install additional hydrants if needed; and they had also met with representatives of the Water Department to discuss relocation of water mains in the area.

President Fleishhacker asked if Santa Fe would provide the funds necessary for relocation of the fire hydrants and the water mains. Mr. Rogers replied in the affirmative.

Assistant Chief Condon advised the Commission that the following requirements would have to be met to resolve the Fire Department's objections to the proposed street vacation:

1. The present old buildings, including the Pioneer Appliance Warehouse will be removed.

2. Access through the area will be maintained at all times for emergency vehicles.

3. The present 12-inch water main located in Michigan Street or one of equal capacity will be maintained, or relocated as necessary, and fire hydrants will be relocated as required by the Fire Department.

4. The new warehouse to be completely sprinklered and built to conform with the San Francisco Building Code.

Mr. Rogers stated that the conditions recommended by the Fire Department were acceptable to his clients.

President Fleishhacker suggested that the Commission should make the conditions a part of its report to the Director of Public Works.

Commissioner Brinton suggested that the conditions should also be included as exhibits in the lease which will be prepared between the Port Commission and the Santa Fe Company. Mr. Rogers felt that it would be better not to include the conditions in the lease; however, he did not object to having them included in the Commission's recommendations.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed vacation of portions of Michigan and Fourth Streets, as shown on SUR-1369, is in conformity with the Master Plan provided that the four conditions recommended by the Fire Department are met.

CURRENT MATTERS CONTINUED

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Newman as to his reaction to the defeat of the San Mateo County Transit proposal, the Director advised the Commission that the staff of the Department of City Planning is already working on a study to determine whether it would be feasible for San Francisco to take the initiative in providing rapid transit service to the airport. He stated that he would mail copies of the work program outline for that study to members of the Commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, June 19, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, June 19, 1969, at 100 Larkin Street, at 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; William M. Brinton, James J. Finn, Thomas J. Mellon, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Marie Carlberg, Planner III; Edward Michael, Planner III; Roland Haney, Planner III; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that he had appeared before the Surplus Property Commission on Monday to comment upon possible uses and design terms of reference for Alcatraz.

The Director informed the Commission that he had attended a meeting of the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors on Tuesday and had participated in a discussion concerning the desirability and feasibility of establishing a Retail Automobile Sales Mart in San Francisco.

The Director advised the Commission that the Planning and Development Committee had indicated that it intends to table the ordinance proposed by the City Planning Commission which would allow car washes as conditional uses in C-2 and C-M districts. The Committee had also indicated that it intends to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance pertaining to automobile wrecking yards and to place that matter before the full Board next Monday.

The Director reported that a proposed resolution which would authorize the Department of City Planning to apply for a Federal Grant to purchase and restore the South San Francisco Opera House is pending before the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors.

The Director informed the Commission that the Acting Zoning Administrator had considered several requests for parking variances for public housing projects for low income families and for elderly people; and he indicated that those projects would eventually come before the Commission as Master Plan referrals.

The Director reported that plans for the proposed Transamerica Building had been received in the offices of the Department of City Planning. As a result, notices were being prepared to advise the public that both the request for vacation of a portion of Merchant Street and the discretionary review of the building plans will be held at 3:00 P.M. on June 26, 1969.

REFERRALS

R69.31 Transfer of Fort Funston Recreation and Park property to the State of California.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported to the Commission on this matter as follows:

"In November of 1961 the electorate approved a bond issue of $1,100,000 for the purchase of 116.3 acres of federal surplus land at Fort Funston for an oceanside park. The City Planning Commission endorsed the bond issue. At that time there were no state funds available for beach and park purchases, but it was contemplated that when such funds became available the State would purchase the land from the City and County of San Francisco, as the campaign arguments for the bond issue stated.

State funds in the amount of $1,239,000 are now available for the purchase, and the Recreation and Park Commission on June 12, 1969, approved the transfer and an agreement with the State whereby the City will develop and maintain the park. The Board of Supervisors will have the matter before it next Monday.

The money from the State must be used to retire the bonds, in accordance with Section 92 of the Charter."

At the conclusion of his report, the Director recommended that the proposed transfer of 116.3 acres of Fort Funston Park to the State of California and the agreement with the State for City development and maintenance of the park is in conformity with the Master Plan.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the proposed transfer of property be approved in accordance with the Director's recommendation.

R69.29 Vacation of Bourbin Street between Ellis and Eddy Streets.

The Director reported on this matter as follows:

"The Redevelopment Agency has requested the vacation of Bourbin Street, located within Western Addition Redevelopment Project Area A-2 between Ellis and Eddy, Steiner and Pierce Streets. Bourbin Street is a one-block long

easement street, 52.5 feet wide, running north and south between Ellis and Eddy Streets, and has no significance for through traffic.

Approximately 100 units of medium density, moderate income housing are to be built in this block by the Fillmore Community Development Association. An existing non-conforming mortuary has been granted a conditional use (CU69.31) to have no expiration date and to develop parking lots in this block including one on a 30 x 75-foot portion of Bourbin Street. The mortuary and the Redevelopment Agency are the sole abutting owners on Bourbin Street.

Although the preliminary redevelopment plan for Area A-2 showed the closing of Bourbin Street, the final approved plan does not show that it is to be closed. The Redevelopment Agency staff is preparing amendments to the plan which will include the Bourbin Street vacation, but they anticipate that construction of the housing will be ready to start before the amendments can be approved."

At the conclusion of his report, the Director recommended that the vacation of Bourbin Street between Ellis and Eddy Streets be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

President Fleishhacker asked if any portions of the vacated street area would be used for the housing project. Robert Reece, representing the Redevelopment Agency, displayed a site plan which had been prepared for the subject lot and indicated that a portion of the vacated street area would be occupied by housing units.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the vacation of Bourbin Street between Ellis and Eddy Streets is in conformity with the Master Plan.

R69.30 Master Plan review - various Capital Improvement Projects proposed for financing by a multi-purpose bond issue.

Project 245.69.102

The Director stated that the first project would involve a $250,000 expenditure for acquisition and remodeling of the building on the southeast corner of Van Ness Avenue and Grove Street; and he recommended that the project be given a general priority rating of ESSENTIAL because it would help to effectuate the provisions of the Civic Center Development plan in the Master Plan.

Wallace Wortman, Director of Property, remarked that the policy of the City has been to acquire the entire northerly half of the subject block for expansion of the Civic Center; and he indicated that various factors had contributed towards the desirability of acquiring the site as soon as possible.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the project be given a general priority rating of ESSENTIAL as recommended by the Director of Planning.

Project 423.68.101

The Director stated that the Department of Public Works was requesting a bond issue in the amount of $150,400 for miscellaneous replacements and repairs, no single project costing more than $6,000. Descriptions of the 38 projects involved had been sent to members of the Commission earlier in the week.

Commissioner Mellon stated that most of the projects included in the proposed bond issue had been deleted from the budget for several years; and he felt that the replacements and repairs would become much more expensive if they were not to be undertaken in the very near future.

The Director recommended that the minutes indicate specific approval of the proposed bond issue in its present form.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes indicate specific approval by the City Planning Commission of project 423.68.101 in its present form.

Project 500.69.116

Joseph Mignola, representing the Department of Public Health, stated that the proposed bond issue, in the amount of $41,700, would be used to install an emergency radio system for the Central Emergency Hospital which would be separate from the Police system. He stated that the Central Emergency Hospital has as large a volume of calls as the Police Department; however, when both agencies are using the same frequencies, the Police calls take precedence. The new system, in addition to ending the conflict between calls for the Central Emergency Hospital and the Police Department, would allow the hospital to talk directly with its ambulances.

The Director recommended that the general priority rating of ESSENTIAL be assigned to the proposed project as a measure promoting public health and safety.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that the general priority rating of ESSENTIAL be assigned to project 500.69.116.

At 2:50 p.m. President Fleishhacker announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

3:00 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

PUBLIC HEARING ON A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE MASTER PLAN OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO SETTING FORTH POLICIES AND PROPOSALS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTHERN WATERFRONT BETWEEN FORT MASON AND CHINA BASIN.

President Fleishhacker commented on the various meetings which had been held by the City Planning Commission since November, 1968, dealing with the Northern Waterfront Plan; and he indicated that all individuals and organizations which had expressed an interest in the previous meetings had been given notice of the present hearing. He stated that the purpose of the public hearing would be to receive comments from the public concerning the objectives, policies, and proposals of the Master Plan amendment for the Northern Waterfront which had been proposed by the staff of the Department of City Planning; and he noted that the Land Use Plan, Transportation Systems Plan, and Landscaping Plan from the staff report were posted on the wall of the meeting room. If the Master Plan amendment were adopted, the Commission would then consider acceptance of the implementation plan which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning as a general guide for implementation action in the Northern Waterfront area. Since further public hearings would be held by the Commission to consider Planning Code amendments and zoning reclassifications within the study area, he asked members of the audience to refrain from detailed discussion of minor issues affecting specific parcels of property during the present hearing.

Michael Marston, representing the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, summarized the key points which had been made in a letter from SPUR to the City Planning Commission date March 17, 1969. He stated that he felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning should be congratulated for the height limit and zoning proposals which were contained in the proposed plan; however, they felt that the plan could be improved if it were to be modified to include three important elements. The first suggestion was that an alternate plan should be prepared for subarea 2 suggesting appropriate nonmaritime uses for that area should the Port facilities presently located there be removed. The second suggestion was that a statement should be made to the effect that the proposed Maritime Parkway would be constructed only when it has become certain that the Port will retain its facilities in the Northern Waterfront area for a long enough period of time to justify the expenditures which would be required for the parkway; and, if the parkway were not to be constructed as proposed, the property which it would have occupied might serve to solve the open space needs of the area. Finally, Mr. Marston suggested that the plans should provide that at least ten percent of the housing to be built in the area should be designed for low-income families.

President Fleishhacker, noting that Mr. Marston had stated that SPUR felt that the proposed Maritime Parkway should not be constructed unless the City were certain that Port operations would continue along the Northern Waterfront for a sufficiently long period of time to justify such an expenditure, asked about the period of time which SPUR might consider sufficient. Mr. Marston replied that

SPUR would not endorse any money for the proposed Maritime Parkway unless it were certain that the Port would retain its operations in the area for at least ten or fifteen years.

Gene Morzenti, representing the Telegraph Hill Survival Association, expressed disappointment at the fact that the City Planning Commission had recommended to the Board of Supervisors that the stub ends of the Embarcadero Freeway not be brought down to ground level. Nevertheless, he hoped that the Commission would be willing to cooperate in the future in trying to find relief from the traffic problems which are caused by the existing Embarcadero Freeway. He stated that much of the northbound traffic on the freeway infiltrates Telegraph Hill after being deposited on Broadway; and, as a result, the block in which he lives has an accident rate more than two and one-half times the rate of the City as a whole. He felt that the Master Plan which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning was essentially a good plan; but he believed that the plan would be improved if it were to contain a recommendation that the stub ends of the Embarcadero Freeway be brought to the ground with ramps similar to those which had been constructed at Clay and Washington Streets.

Ed Turner, representing the Marine Cooks and Stewards Union, remarked that very little mention had been made in the staff report of the desirability of constructing a new ship passenger terminal. He stated that the Port Commission already has plans to move the American President Lines to Pier 33; and, as a result, he felt that the problems associated with passenger ship loadings would become much worse than at present. He stated that his Union fills 1,200 jobs on passenger ships out of San Francisco every month; and he indicated that 31 passenger ships had departed from San Francisco during the last month. He pointed out that passenger ships bring revenue to the City both by providing jobs and by bringing tourists to the area. Yet, while most other major ports have adequate ship-passenger terminal facilities, San Francisco's Port Commission had not been willing to provide such facilities because of the viewpoint held by one of its members that such facilities would not make money. Mr. Turner believed that a new ship-passenger terminal would make money; and he believed that such a facility should be given a strong endorsement in the Commission's plan.

Gerson Bakar, owner of property located within the study area, noted that his property, site of the Northpoint Project, is almost fully developed. Therefore, he had no personal objections to the plan. However, he felt that it would benefit the Cost-Plus complex, Fisherman's Wharf, and his own project if the parking structure which had been proposed for the Municipal Railway's Kirkland Yard could be located one block to the west on property which the Scavengers Protective Association had indicated a willingness to sell. Mr. Bakar stated that he was very sympathetic with the staff's recommendation that pedestrian use of Fisherman's Wharf be emphasized; and he indicated that he did not understand the reasons for the objections to that propsal which had come from the Fisherman's Wharf Association. He also agreed with the height limits which were being proposed in principle; however, in cases where many properties are under a single ownership, such as the properties located on the east side of Telegraph Hill, he felt that the flat height limits could be pierced in certain specified places without ruining the sanctity of the

view from Telegraph Hill. In conclusion, Mr. Bakar noted that the type of apartments presently being constructed in the Northern Waterfront area do not create a great demand for parking; and, consequently, he felt that the Commission should give some consideration to the desirability of providing relief from the current one-for-one parking ratio.

Karl Kortum, representing the San Francisco Maritime Museum, regarded the Northern Waterfront Plan as the most vital piece of master planning that the Commission would ever be likely to consider. He believed that proper use of the waterfront property would be important to the health and reputation of the entire City; and, for that reason, he urged the Commission to reach its decisions regarding the plan with the utmost care. He noted that many of the faces in the audience were familiar; and he remarked that it was unfortunate that greater publicity had not been given to the plan so that more citizens of San Francisco would have become interested in it. As an amateur in the field of Planning, he was able to see many proposals in the plan which, if executed, would inevitably lead to quarrels; and, under the circumstances, he felt that the plan should be referred to respected planners outside of the City for reactions and comments.

Mr. Kortum indicated his objection to the proposed eight-story building south of the Ferry Building which would extend further into the Bay than any existing structure; and he indicated that it was his impression that the proposed "island" to be located off-shore from Fisherman's Wharf would destroy one of the City's most precious views. He felt that the comments which had been made by Mr. Turner regarding the Passenger Terminal were significant; and he urged that further efforts be made by the Commission to obtain comments on the plan from other representatives of the shipping industry. In conclusion, he suggested that the Commission, in taking action on the plan, should not lightly recommend that maritime uses in the Northern Waterfront area be replaced by hotels.

Commissioner Brinton stated that he had served on the City Planning Commission for over five years; and, during that time, only two or three hearings which had been held by the Commission had generated City-wide interest. He agreed with Mr. Kortum that it was unfortunate that a greater number of people had not become involved in the process of preparing a plan for the Northern Waterfront area; however, the Commission had given notice of the present hearing to everyone who had previously expressed an interest in the plan.

Mr. Kortum suggested that the Commission should have made greater use of newspapers and television to publicize the plan.

Mrs. L. J. Beauchamp, 3 Bostonship Plaza, represented the Parent Teacher Associations of Francisco and Washington Irving Schools. She stated that the organizations which she represented shared Mr. Morzenti's concern about traffic problems along Broadway; and they had written to the Board of Supervisors urging the stub ends of the Embarcadero Freeway be brought to the ground to discourage people going to the Golden Gate Bridge from using Broadway and Columbus Avenue. She stated that she lives in the Golden Gateway; and she advised the Commission that many children from that development, as well as many children from Chinatown, have

to cross Broadway to get to school. Under the circumstances, she felt that it was important for their safety that the amount of traffic carried on Broadway be reduced.

Donald Fisher, owner of property located at 300 Broadway, stated that he had made a precise study of the effect which the proposed reduction of height limits from 84 feet to 65 feet would have on his property; and he indicated that he would present the results of his study during the hearing on zone changes which would be held by the Commission on a future date. He stated that he was pleased with the concise recommendations which had been made by the staff of the Department of City Planning regarding the study area; however, he felt that some of the recommendations could be harmful both for the property owners in the area and for the City as a whole. For instance, he felt that the proposal to reduce height limits from 84 feet to 65 feet was not consistent with the objectives which had previously been stated by the Department of City Planning; and he regarded the 84-foot height limit itself to be extremely low compared with height limits which had been established for other areas of the City. If existing height limits were to be further reduced, the tax base of the City would be reduced at the same time; and it seemed to him that the Commission would not wish to take an action which would have such a result. Reduction of height limits from 84 feet to 65 feet would reduce land values by 25 percent; and, therefore, the the reduction would involve confiscation of property without compensation. Furthermore, if the height reductions were enacted without any assurance being given that other aspects of the plan would be achieved, an even greater burden would be placed on the property owners involved. Under the circumstances, he felt that reduction ot the height limits should be accomplished as one of the last phases of implementation of the proposed plan rather than at the very beginning. He agreed that it might be desirable to have less height on the east side of the Embarcadero than on the west side of the street; but he felt that lesser height could be achieved by means other than imposition of a flat height limit. In conclusion, he stated that he would make a presentation at a later date to illustrate how the existing 84-foot height limit would not result in the blocking of all of the views along the waterfront.

Lewis Lindsay, representing the San Francisco Citizens Planning Committee felt that sll of the problems in the study area had resulted from the automobile; and he suggested that no forms of transportation other than railways and steamships should be allowed in the area. He felt that the Embarcadero Freeway should be removed; and he urged tha Commission not to be overly impressed with Monorails which he believed that some people are trying to use as a subversive movement against BART. In addition, he remarked that some people seem to want to turn San Francisco into a glorified Disneyland or a "honky tonk" town; and he hoped that the Commission would not be of the same disposition.

Mrs. Morse Erskine suggested that the Commission might investigate the possibility of surrounding Telegraph Hill with a scenic easement. She noted that a great deal of property which might be used for such a purpose is already in public ownership; and she felt that the owners of private property on the Hill might be willing to donate property for the creation of such an easement. Mrs. Erskine also mentioned a vacant triangle of land on Chestnut Street which has value as a scenic point; and, if the property is not already owned by the City, she felt that it should be acquired as part of the City Park system.

The Director remarked that the scenic easement proposed by Mrs. Erskine would not be inconsistent with the plan which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning. He indicated that he was not familiar with the other parcel of property which she had mentioned.

Ron C. Lord, representing the Trans Pacific Passenger Conference, stated that his organization represents fourteen Steamship Lines which serve the Pacific Coast. He indicated that he had not been advised of the present hearing until the previous day; and at least six of the steamship lines which he represented had not received notice of the hearing. He advised the Commission that his organization was wholeheartedly in support of a new steamship passenger terminal and that it intended to make every effort to see the project become a reality. Any cooperation which would be given by the Commission towards that end would be appreciated.

President Fleishhacker noted that the proposed Northern Waterfront Plan had been given a great deal of publicity; and he wondered how Mr. Lord had failed to learn of it until such a late date. Mr. Lord replied that he had been aware that the Northern Waterfront study was being made; however, he had received no notice of the public hearing presently being held by the Commission.

Mrs. Jean Kortum, representing the Protect Our Waterfront Committee, read portions of a letter which she had addressed to the Commission on March 5, 1969. She noted that the Commission was being asked to determine whether the Northern Waterfront should be used for commercial activities, parks and open space, or for shipping; and she questioned whether the citizens of San Francisco had been given sufficient opportunity to reach their own decision on the matter in accordance with the democratic process. Members of her organization, for instance, were deeply disappointed in the amount of open space which would be provided by the proposed plan. She remarked that the State legislation which had originally authorized release of Port lands for non-Port uses after the adoption of a plan for the Northern Waterfront area had stated that any properties to be released would have to be developed for maximum profit; however, legislation which had been enacted when the Port was returned to the City had permitted surplus Port properties to be used for many purposes, including recreational uses. In her opinion, the new legislation established a mandate for construction of more public recreational facilities on surplus Port lands.

Mrs. Kortum advised the Commission that Congressman Mailliard had conducted a poll in urban areas to determine how surplus Government lands should be used. The results of the poll indicated that 56 percent of the people interviewed felt that such properties should be reserved for open space, 19 percent felt that the properties should be used for hospitals and other public facilities, 18 percent felt that the properties should be used for low-cost public housing, and 7 percent felt that the properties should be sold. On the basis of that poll,

she felt that it was fair to say that the plan being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning for the Northern Waterfront area would appeal to only 7 percent of the citizens of San Francisco; and she was firmly convinced that any Port-owned properties which are not to be used for maritime purposes should be used for public purposes and not for hotels, etc. In any case, she did not believe that existing Port facilities in the Northern Waterfront area are obsolete; and she felt that they would continue to be needed to supplement the new containerization facilities which are being constructed in the southern portion of the City.

David Jenkins, representing the legislative committee of the International Longshoremen Workers Union, felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning had done an extraordinary job in preparing a plan for the Northern Waterfront area; and he did not intend to discredit their efforts. However, while at least 17,000 of the workers along the waterfront are members of minority groups, he noted that the audience which was presently commenting upon the merits of the plan was composed exclusively of white people. Under the circumstances, he felt that it should be the responsibility of the Commission to involve more people in the decision-making process before taking action on the proposed plan. Unlike Mr. and Mrs. Kortum, he was not interested in matters of aesthetics or in the provision of additional parks and playgrounds; rather, he was concerned about jobs and the dignity of people who work on the waterfront. He felt that the Northern Waterfront Plan should provide housing for elderly couples and single men who have lived and worked on the waterfront; and he also felt the plan should provide recreational and eating facilities for the men who work on the waterfront. Furthermore, he suggested that the City Planning Commission should offer a formal guarantee that any revenue derived from non-maritime use of Port-owned properties in the Northern Waterfront area would be used solely for the improvement of shipping facilities along the Southern Waterfront. Mr. Jenkins advised the Commission that many negro Longshoremen would be interested in investigating in black businesses along the waterfront; and he felt that the Commission had an obligation to assist in the realization of such projects. In conclusion, he asked the Commission to consider the possibility of recommending that the entire Northern Waterfront study area become an official redevelopment project area so that the plan for the area could be accomplished more easily.

Mrs. Hans Klussmann, representing San Francisco Beautiful, stated that her organization had attended many meetings concerning the Northern Waterfront study. While she was pleased to see many new faces in the audience, she regretted that the points of view which they represented had not been presented to the Commission at an earlier date. She felt that many of the new suggestions which had been made during the present hearing could be incorporated into the plan; yet, at the same time, she realized that the Commission, in making its decision, would have to recognize that a real conflict does exist between the objectives of trying to keep the tax rate down and of trying to provide more public facilities on publicly-owned land.

6/19/69

Gerald Cauthen, representing the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, summarized the comments which had previously been made by his organization regarding the proposed plan. He remarked that whatever treatment is given to the Northern Waterfront Area will be of great importance; and he hoped that the Commission would approach its responsibilities in that light. Although the original plan which had been prepared by John S. Bolles and Associates had been strengthened and clarified by the staff of the Department of City Planning, it still did not seem to provide enough open space to meet the needs of the study area. Mr. Cauthen stated that the members of his association favored retention of shipping activities in the area to the extent feasible; and he indicated that he believed that it would be feasible to retain such activities. He agreed with the staff's basic philosophy regarding height limits; however, he indicated that he wished to discuss the proposed height limits in greater detail whenever a public hearing is held to discuss zone changes in the study area. He stated that members of his association were in favor of de-emphasizing the automobile within the study area, believing that emphasis should be placed on public transportation systems instead. However, in view of that position, he requested that the transit gap between the Ferry Building and Davis Street on Market Street be closed so that proper service would be provided for people frequenting the Heliport, the Ferry Port, and the various commercial activities which are likely to develop in the vicinity of the Ferry Building. Finally, he stated that members of his association were opposed to the construction of outdoor advertising signs within the study area.

Mr. Cauthen stated that he had hoped that the Port Authority would be represented at the present hearing, primarily because he had understood that the Port was convinced that piers located in the Northern Waterfront area would become obsolete by definition because of the trend towards containerization. He indicated, however, that he had talked with various shipping executives in Europe, many of whom had stated that their companies had not even begun to give consideration to the development of plans for the handling of containerized cargo. As a result of those discussions, he was convinced that traditional forms of shipping would continue to create a demand for the type of facilities presently available in San Francisco; and containerized facilities would become only one mode of the shipping industry. He had also been advised that the Port Commission objected to the amount of open space which was provided for in the proposed plan; yet, in Frankfurt, Germany, a city comparable in size to San Francisco, more than 800 percent more open space has been provided in the vicinity of the Port than is the case in San Francisco.

President Fleishhacker summarized letters which have been received from Samuel H. Husbands, Jr., a member of the San Francisco Port Commission, and from Rae F. Watts, Port Director. In his letter, Mr. Husbands stated that he personally had found that "those areas in San Francisco, or any city, for that matter, that are essentially unplanned by overseeing public bodies, and have grown with some degree of spontaneity, are the most agreeable aesthetically"; and, especially since he felt that the developments which would be allowed under the proposed plan would be only "marginally economic", he felt that individual entrepreneurs, risking

their own funds to attract customers, should be left in charge of the development of the Northern Waterfront area without being bound by the restrictions which had been proposed by the staff of the Department of City Planning in their plan.

Mr. Watts' letter read, in part, as follows:

> "It is the feeling of this Commission that the plan proposes entirely too many restrictions to permit the Port to proceed with an economically feasible development program for the Northern Waterfront. Our inability to implement this program will preclude our continuing to provide for the needs of the maritime industry, with the consequence that the Port can no longer hope to maintain its self-supporting status."

Attached to Mr. Watts' letter was a seven page memorandum which had been prepared by E. L. Sembler, Chief Engineer for the Port Commission, commenting upon the Northern Waterfront Plan which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning. His comments were summarized on pages 6 and 7 of the memorandum as follows:

"The plan as proposed with its many excellent ideas and proposals does several things which the San Francisco Port Commission must recognize.

1. Limits the economic use of the Northern Waterfront.

2. Gives complete and full control to the Planning Commission for all development.

3. Would be economically harmful to the existing establishments at Fisherman's Wharf.

4. Proposes to accomplish by 1985 an improvement program that is not economically feasible.

Certain policies are advocated which it is believed are objectionable such as:

1. Holding the present seawall and water coverage as a limit of development.

2. Unrealistic planning in the Fisherman's Wharf area such as limiting access and parking, making this area less desirable as a commercial area.

3. Utilizing an excess of the San Francisco Port Commission's properties for public open space.

4. Restricting traffic flow from downtown to the Ferry Building and from the Freeway and street system to the maritime area.

5. Setting such high aesthetic standards as to limit or eliminate economic development.

6. Unrealistic planning for capital improvements.

7. Removing control of area from San Francisco Port Commission and giving it to the San Francisco Planning Commission.

We would suggest, along with our previous comments, that they revise the plan as follows:

1. Consider the development of the area out to the ends of the present piers.

2. Propose high-rise, high-density development on Telegraph Hill.

3. Raise height limits and revise view corridor concept on the Northern waterfront."

Mr. Jenkins stated that he had attended the last meeting of the Port Commission; and he indicated that the Port Commission had taken no official action on the Norther Waterfront Plan at that time. They had merely been advised by their director, Mr. Watts, that copies of the memorandum which had been prepared by Mr. Sembler would be sent to them for their review.

Commissioner Mellon asked if Mr. Jenkins, in making his presentation to the Commission earlier in the afternoon, had intended to imply that the Northern Waterfront Plan proposed by the staff of the Department of City Planning would discourage or prevent black investors from establishing businesses in the Northern Waterfront area. Mr. Jenkins replied that he had meant to imply only that the plan did not make a positive attempt to provide opportunities for black investors wishing to establish businesses in the Northern Waterfront area; and he felt that a program similar to those in operation at Hunters Point and in the Western Addition should be made a part of the proposed plan.

Commissioner Mellon asked if Mr. Jenkins believed that anything in the plan would prevent black investors from establishing businesses within the study area. Mr. Jenkins replied in the negative.

The Director stated that all comments which had been received in writing had been taken into consideration by the staff of the Department of City Planning; however, before making his recommendation to the Commission, he wished to comment upon the issues which had been raised during the course of the present hearing, as follows:

Mr. Marston — The Director agreed with Mr. Marston that a plan should be prepared for subarea 2 if maritime uses should be phased out of that area; however, given present circumstances, he saw no reason why such a specific plan should be prepared immediately. Rather, he felt that any energy expended at the present time should be directed towards an effort to keep the maritime uses within that subarea. He did not agree with Mr. Marston that construction of the Embarcadero Parkway should be made contingent upon continued operation of Port facilities in the area, particularly since the need for the parkway was not related solely to maritime activities. With regard to Mr. Marston's suggestion that at least ten percent of the housing to be provided within the study area should be designed for low-income families, the Director remarked that the staff report had recommended that a certain percentage of housing for low-income families would be desirable; however, he pointed out that there would be no way of effectuating that recommendation.

Mr. Morzenti — The Director stated that the City Planning Commission had already taken an official action recommending that the stub ends of Embarcadero Freeway not be brought down to ground level; and he remarked that the matter is now pending before the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Turner — The Director stated that he had no disagreement with Mr. Turner regarding the importance of a new steamship passenger terminal; and, to the extent possible, he would be willing to assist in the achievement of that objective.

Mr. Bakar — The Director stated that the proposed plan was intended to serve as a flexible guideline for development of the study area; and, therefore, adoption of the plan would not prevent a slight shift in the location of the garage structure proposed to be built on the Kirkland Yards.

Mr. Kortum — The Director was of the opinion that nothing would be gained from sending the proposed plan to outside Planning consultants for review. However, he did not disagree with Mr. Kortum that some of the proposals in the plan would inevitably lead to quarrels. Nevertheless, since quarreling is ultimately a form of participation, he felt that it has some merit. In any case, as future developments come before the Commission for review, some guidelines would be needed by the Commission as a basis for judgment; and it was his recommendation that the plan which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning be adopted as the Commission's official guideline.

Mrs. Beauchamp — The Director noted that her arguments had been the same as those presented by Mr. Morzenti; and he indicated that his response was the same.

Mr. Fisher — As Mr. Fisher had indicated during the course of his comments, the matter of specific height limitations would be discussed more thoroughly at a later date when a public hearing is scheduled for consideration of Planning Code and zone changes for the study area.

Mr. Lindsay — The Director stated that he both agreed and disagreed with Mr. Lindsay.

Mrs. Erskine — The Director remarked that he had already commented on Mrs. Erskine's suggestions.

Mr. Lord — The Director stated that he had already clarified his position regarding a new steamship passenger terminal.

Mrs. Kortum — Although Mrs. Kortum was still not satisfied with the amount of open space which was being proposed in the plan, the Director emphasized that the staff of the Department of City Planning had proposed a greater amount of open space for the area than had originally been recommended by the Commission's consultant. He agreed with Mrs. Kortum that many of the existing shipping facilities in the Northern Waterfront area will not become obsolete even though the current trend is towards construction of containerization facilities; and the plan which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning was not neant to encourage phasing out of existing facilities. However, if maritime activities were to be removed from some specific areas, he thought it would be important to have an officially adopted plan containing recommendations as to the best alternate uses for those areas.

Mr. Jenkins — The Director stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had made every effort possible to notify everyone about the present hearing; and, if the audience happened to turn out unmixed racially, he felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning should not be considered to be at fault. He had no objection to construction of recreational and eating facilities within the study area for people who work on the waterfront; however, since those facilities within the study area for people who work on the waterfront; however, since those facilities could be considered to be for public use, the plan, as proposed, would not have to be altered to make it possible for them to be constructed.

Mrs. Klussmann — The Director agreed with Mrs. Klussmann that there is a basic conflict between efforts to lower the tax rates and efforts to provide additional open space.

Mr. Cauthen — Mr. Cauthen, also, had commented both on the importance of providing more open space within the study area and on the importance of retaining shipping activities in the area; and the Director felt that he had commented sufficiently on both issues. Mr. Cauthen had also urged that pedestrian systems be emphasized in the study area; and, in response, the Director remarked that is was his opinion that the plan being recommended by the staff was highly pedestrian-oriented. The Director agreed with Mr. Cauthen that large outdoor advertising signs would be inappropriate in the study area.

Mr. Husbands — The Director regarded Mr. Husband's letter as a statement of a "Do not Plan!" philosophy; he pointed out, however, that it is the function of the Department of City Planning to plan. He did not agree with Mr. Husbands that public agencies are incapable of planning good projects; and he pointed to Golden Gate Park, Market Street, various urban renewal projects, and the Civic Center in support of his position.

The Director advised the Commission that he had received a letter from M. Justin Herman, Executive Director of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, in which Mr. Herman endorsed the plan's concept for mixed use of commercial and residential use along much of the Northern Waterfront area. Mr. Herman also agreed that public policy should result in programming a portion of the housing to be constructed in the area for lower income households, particularly for elderly singles and childless couples. However, Mr. Herman indicated that he disagreed with the Northern Waterfront Plan's proposals for traffic circulation in the south of Market area which would conflict with plans for the Yerba Buena center. In conclusion, Mr. Herman suggested that a task force, consisting of representatives of various City agencies, should be established to aid in implementation of the plan.

The Director indicated that he had also received a letter from S. Myron Tatarian, Director of Public Works, raising a number of questions regarding traffic proposals contained in the Northern Waterfront plan. After summarizing the questions which had been raised by Mr. Tatarian, the Director stated that he was confident that most of the problems could be resolved during the implementation period.

Referring to the letter and memorandum which had been sent to members of the Commission by Mr. Watts, the Director remarked that Mr. Watts was, in

effect, taking the position that none of the recommendations contained in the proposed plan had any merit. While Mr. Watts contended that the height limits proposed in the plan would prevent the economic development of Port properties, the Director indicated that he completely disagreed with that point of view. In fact, he surmised that the Port Commission would prefer to have no restrictions established for their property whatsoever. The Director stated that he had discussed the proposed plan with econimic consultants who had indicated that the proposed restrictions would not prevent economic development of properties in the area; furthermore, he had been in touch with several developers who are presently preparing building plans which would meet the standards being recommended by the staff. He acknowledged that economic returns from properties within the study area would not be as great if the plan were adopted as they would be if no restrictions whatsoever were to be established; however, the same principle would hold true for any other area of the City.

The Director denied the Port's assertion that adoption of the proposed plan would transfer control over development of Port properties from the Port to the City Planning Commission; and, as a matter of fact, discussions with the Port had convinced the staff of the Department of City Planning that proposals for nonmaritime use of Port properties should be treated as conditional uses in order that such proposals might be treated with a reasonable degree of flexibility. If that decision had not been made, the staff would have wanted to propose legislation which would have prevented the construction of anything which might conceivable be bad on Port-owned properties; and the restrictions which would have been recommended would have been much tighter than those now being proposed.

The Director recommended adoption of the draft resolution which he had prepared which contained the following resolves:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission does hereby adopt as an amendment to the Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco and as a part thereof, that certain document and precise plan entitled "Master Plan Amendment for the Northern Waterfront" dated May 1969 and comprising 50 pages of text including sections entitled Introduction, Objectives and Policies, The Northern Waterfront Plan, and Summary, and 3 maps entitled Land Use Plan, Transportation Systems Plan and Landscaping Plan;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That that certain document and precise plan entitled "Master Plan Amendment for the Northern Waterfront" dated May 1969 and comprising 50 pages of text and 3 maps constitues a substantial modification and addition to the existing Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco, and any provisions of the existing Master Plan, whether appearing in the text or on a map, that are inconsistent with the said Master Plan Amendment for the Northern Waterfront are hereby declared to be of no further force and effect;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the President of the City Planning Commission and the Director of City Planning shall record the Commission's action on the text and on each of the maps comprising the Master Plan Amendment for the Northern Waterfront, and the Secretary of this Commission is hereby directed to certify an attested copy thereof to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors."

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6385.

The Director then recommended adoption of a second draft resolution which contained the following resolves:

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission does hereby accept as a general guide and as a basis for consideration of specific implementation measures the "Northern Waterfront Implementation Plan", dated May 1969, comprising 12 pages of text including sections entitled Introduction, Public Development Actions, Public Regulatory Actions, and Capital Improvements in the Northern Waterfront, and 3 maps entitled Proposed Zoning, Proposed Special Use Districts and Proposed Height Limits;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission finds that the said Northern Waterfront Implementation Plan is in accord with the Master Plan Amendment for the Northern Waterfront as previously adopted."

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution accepting the Northern Waterfront Implementation Plan be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6386.

Subsequently, the Director recommended adoption of a third draft resolution which would declare the Commission's intention of holding a public hearing to consider proposing to the Board of Supervisors amendments to the text of the City Planning Code and the zoning map of the City and County of San Francisco based on the Master Plan amendment for the Northern Waterfront which had just been adopted by the Commission; the resolution would also authorize the Zoning Administrator to set a time and place for the public hearing. The earliest possible date on which the hearing might be set would be August 14, 1969. In any case, all property owners within a 300-foot radius of the study area would receive official notice of the meeting.

President Fleishhacker asked if other interested parties would be notified of the meeting, also. The Director replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6387.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, June 26, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, June 26, 1969, at 2:00 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; William Brinton, James K. Carr, Thomas J. Mellon, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV, (Zoning); Robert DeVelbiss, Planner III, (Zoning); James White, Planner III, Urban Design; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Dick Halgren represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Elinor Hayes represented the Oakland Tribune.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Brinton, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of June 5, 1969, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that the Board of Supervisors, meeting on Monday, had approved the sale of Fort Funston Park to the State, provided that payment is made in cash rather than in State bonds.

The Director advised the Commission that the Board had postponed hearing of the proposed automobile wrecking amendment of the City Planning Code until next Monday.

The Director informed the Commission that the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors, meeting on Wednesday, had approved a proposed resolution which would authorize the Department of City Planning to apply for a Federal grant for acquisition and restoration of the South San Francisco Opera House.

At this point in the proceedings Commissioner Carr arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

R69.32 Turnkey Housing Project for the elderly, southeast corner of Sanchez Street and Duboce Avenue.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, reported on this matter as follows:

"The subject site, which is zoned R-4, is within approximately two blocks of stores, restaurants, and various personal services along Market Street, the Safeway Store at Church and Market Streets being the largest such facility. Duboce Park, on the north side of Duboce Avenue immediately west of the subject site, contains indoor facilities for adult activities as well as providing open space. Residential development in the immediately surrounding R-4 and R-3 zoned area is low- and medium-density in occupancy, and low-rise in height. The topography to the east, north and south of subject site is relatively flat; to the west the grade rises. Public transit is provided the subject site by the N-Judah streetcar line along Duboce Avenue and several bus lines within one block of the site. Franklin Hospital is approximately one block to the west.

The subject site has frontages of 100 feet on Duboce Avenue and 210 feet on Sanchez Street and is 23,500 square feet in area. Under the Planning Code a maximum of 118 dwelling units would be permitted. Approximately half of the subject site is currently vacant; the remainder is occupied by two dwellings and two non-conforming commercial-industrial buildings.

Preliminary plans for the proposed housing by John S. Bolles, Associates show the northern half of the building as seven floors high and the southern portion four floors high. The fifth floor would be used as a common recreation area adjacent to a roof terrace over the four floor portion of the building. Fifteen off-street parking spaces would be provided. The plans may be modified at the request of the Housing Authority.

An application for variances from the parking requirements of the Planning Code, which otherwise requires the provision of 50 spaces for 100 units of elderly housing, and from the rear yard requirements of the Code has been heard but not yet decided, by the Zoning Administrator. The Social Services Committee of the Board of Supervisors held a public hearing concerning the subject proposal on June 19, 1969, and took the matter under submission pending the Planning Commission's recommendation."

The Director recommended that the project be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the development of the southeast corner of Duboce Avenue and Sanchez Street, Block 3537, Lots 45,46,47,48 and 49 for Turnkey Housing for low-income elderly persons is in conformity with the Master Plan.

CURRENT MATTERS (Continued)

The Director distributed copies of letters which had been sent to the Superintendent of Schools and to the Commanding Officer of the Presidio during the past week by President Fleishhacker. Following the recent meeting between a committee of the City Planning Commission and the Presidio Post Engineer, there had been general agreement that the first of the two new schools to be constructed in the vicinity would be located on the Lobos Creek site rather than on the El Polin site; however, in the interim since that meeting, it had been learned that the Army had decided to give first priority to the construction of the El Polin School. Under the circumstances, the letters which President Fleishhacker had addressed to the Superintendent of Schools and to the Commanding Officer of the Presidio had requested that the Unified School District should make the final determination on school enrollment projections and on which school should be constructed first, preferably the Lobos Creek School.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED LANDMARKS

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, described the architectural and historical character of each of the seven buildings indicated on the agenda which are located in the Jackson Square area. Subsequently, the Commission considered the proposals in the following order:

THE BANK OF LUCAS, TURNER, AND COMPANY AT 800 MONTGOMERY STREET (LM68.22)

The Commission, noting that no one was present to represent the owner of the subject building, asked if the owner had been notified of the subject hearing. Robert DeVelbiss, Planner III, (Zoning) replied that a number of letters had been addressed to the owner of the subject building. Yet, while none of the letters had been returned, no response had been received from the owner. The building had already been designated as a State Historical Landmark; and the owner might have felt that the correspondence related to that previous designation.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6388 be adopted and that the Bank of Lucas, Turner, and Company, located at 800 Montgomery Street be designated as a landmark.

THE SOLARI BUILDING WEST AT 472 JACKSON STREET (LM68.27)
THE SOLARI BUILDING EAST AT 470 JACKSON STREET (LM68.28)

No one was present to represent the owners of the two subject buildings. Mr. Develbiss stated that no specific communication had been received from the owners regarding their reaction to the proposed designation of the buildings as landmarks.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Brinton, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6389 be adopted and that the Solari Building west, located at 472 Jackson Street, be designated as a landmark.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6390 be adopted and that the Solari Building east, located at 470 Jackson Street, be designated as a landmark.

THE MOULINIE BUILDING AT 458-460 JACKSON STREET (LM68.25)

Edward Thayer of the Wells Fargo Bank represented the owner of the subject building. He stated that neither he nor his client understood the provisions of the Landmark Ordinance; and, therefore, they were opposed to the proposal to designate the Moulinie Building as a landmark.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, explained that the City Planning Commission would have the right to review any changes which the owner might propose to make on the exterior of the building if it were to be designated as a landmark. In addition, the Commission would have the right to hold any demolition permit affecting the subject building for a maximum period of six months to provide an opportunity for another person to purchase and preserve the building. The Board of Supervisors would be able to hold the demolition permit for an additional maximum period of six months.

Mrs. Peter Platt, representing the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, remarked that the historical flavor of the subject building might be improved if certain exterior changes were to be made; and she was confident that the Landmarks Board would approve and support such changes.

Mr. Thayer asked if he could be given a copy of the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance and of the resolution which would be adopted by the Commission designating his client's building as a landmark. President Fleishhacker replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6391 be adopted and that the Moulinie Building, located at 458-460 Jackson Street, be designated as a landmark.

THE PRESIDIO AND FERRIES RAILROAD CAR BARN AT 440 JACKSON STREET (LM68.26)

Richard Paganini, owner of the subject building, stated that he was opposed to having his building designated as a landmark; however, he hoped that action by the Commission on the proposal could be postponed until a later date so that his interest could be represented by his attorney. He stated that he had received notification through his bank only four days ago that the building was being considered as a landmark.

The Director stated that it was conceivable that Mr. Paganini's bank had been negligent in notifying him that the building was being considered as a landmark; and, under the circumstances, he recommended that the Commission postpone action on the subject building for approximately three weeks.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Carr, and carried unanimously that further consideration of the subject building be postponed indefinitely.

Commissioner Carr remarked that the language contained in the draft resolutions being considered by the Commission provided that the buildings should be "preserved generally in all of their particular exterior features" existing at the present time. However, in view of the fact that many of the buildings would have a better architectural quality if some of the existing features were to be changed, he believed that the language of the draft resolutions should be changed to encourage renovations which would change the appearance of the buildings to their original form.

THE YEON BUILDING AT 432 JACKSON STREET (LM68.21)

Richard Brown, representing the owner of the subject building, stated that his client was very much in favor of having his building designated as a landmark; however, he felt that the building had been inaccurately described by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.

Mr. DeVelbiss stated that a letter had been received from Mr. Yeon requesting that the description of the building which had originally occupied the site be revised; however, it had not been possible to obtain accurate information regarding that building.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Brinton, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6392 be adopted and that the Yeon Building, located at 432 Jackson Street, be designated as a landmark.

THE GROGAN-LENT-ATHERTON BUILDING AT 400 JACKSON STREET (LM68.20)

Helen Heskins, owner of the subject building, asked if buildings designated as landmarks would be given special tax considerations. The Director replied that the Assessor had indicated that tax decisions regarding land-

mark buildings would have to be made on an individual basis. He pointed out, however, that the subject building is located within a special height limit district; and he stated that the Assessor had confirmed that height limits are considered when assessments are set.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6393 be adopted and that the Grogan-Lent-Atherton Building, located at 400 Jackson Street, be designated as a landmark.

GHIRARDELLI SQUARE, A COMPLEX OF BUILDINGS OCCUPYING THE BLOCK BOUNDED BY NORTHPOINT, BEACH, AND LARKIN STREETS (LM68.29)

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, described the architectural and historical characteristics of Ghirardelli Square.

Mr. Rose, representing the owners of the subject property, stated that they felt that it would be a great honor to have their property designated as a landmark.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Carr, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6394 be adopted and that Ghirardelli Square be designated as a landmark.

THE BURR HOUSE, 1772 Vallejo Street (LM69.1)

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, described the architectural attributes and history of the subject building, noting that its garden provides an unusually spacious setting for the building, setting it off from its neighbors.

Mrs. Gerbode, owner of the subject property, stated that she had no objection to the proposal to designate her building as a landmark.

Mrs. John E. Tobin, a neighbor, felt that it was important to recognize the value of preserving the City's history. If San Francisco were to be turned into a "plastic city", she was confident that the City's economic growth would go elsewhere.

Commissioner Porter thanked Mrs. Gerbode for her cooperation in supporting the designation of her property as a landmark.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Brinton, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6395 be adopted and that the Burr House, located at 1772 Vallejo Street, be designated as a landmark.

At 2:50 p.m. President Fleishhacker announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. Commissioner Kearney joined the Commission at this point.

R69.24 Vacation of a portion of Merchant Street between Sansome and Montgomery Streets for proposed Transamerica Building.
(Postponed from meeting of June 12, 1969.)

President Fleishhacker read a letter which had been addressed to members of the Commission by Mayor Joseph L. Alioto as follows:

"Today the Planning Commission will conduct its discretionary review of the proposed Transamerica Building at Sansome and Montgomery Streets.

It is my intention to write the Board of Supervisors, supporting action to close Merchant Street to make this development possible.

I feel your Commission is entitled to my views at this time since the Commission must also make its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

It is impressive that Transamerica Corporation has made substantial modifications to the original plan as a result of long discussions with the Planning Director and other staff members of your Honorable Commission. I am also impressed with the fact that five to seven million dollars more than ordinarily would be the case will be expended in order to achieve the design of the building.

It is my general view that City government must control the overall matter of beauty in the City's environment, but I also believe that, with respect to the matter of design of a building, the decisions of an internationally famed architect such as Mr. Pereira should be given considerable weight unless it can be said that all reasonable persons must agree that the design is inappropriate. There is no disputing different tastes where the tastes are at a high level. I, for one, believe that the design of the building will add considerable urban beauty to San Francisco.

Today you consider the closing of Merchant Street. The technical problems are the questions of access by the adjacent owners, and the attendant traffic considerations.

I do not ask the Commission to change the law for the Transamerica Corporation or for any other firm, but to act entirely within the framework of existing laws and regulations. My recommendation is that the Commission approve the closing of Merchant Street."

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported on the proposed vacation of a portion of Merchant Street as follows:

"The proposal is to vacate the City's fee interest in the westerly 183.33 feet of Merchant Street in the block between Sansome and Montgomery Streets. This vacation would leave the easterly 229.16 feet of Merchant Street in this block as a dead-end street. Merchant Street is 31 feet wide.

Transamerica Corporation, the applicant for this vacation, either owns or controls Assessor's Lots 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 17 in Block 207, which constitute all of the land abutting the portion of Merchant Street sought to be vacated. Transamerica also owns or controls Lot 19, not abutting the proposed vacation. There are an additional eight lots with frontage on the remaining portion of Merchant Street, none of which is owned or controlled by Transamerica. Seven of these eight other lots have frontage on either Washington, Clay or Sansome Streets in addition to Merchant Street, but five of them currently do use Merchant Street for access.

The purpose of the request for vacation is to permit Transamerica to erect a major office building that would occupy the vacated street area as well as property to the north and south of it. Last March, plans were filed for a site permit on a site smaller than that now controlled by the applicant, and the building design then called for retention of Merchant Street for its entire length rather than the closing of the westerly portion. In those early plans, Merchant Street would have continued under the building tower through a tunnel. In the revised plans submitted on June 16, Merchant Street would simply be deadended, and the only access through to Montgomery Street would be for pedestrians through the lower lobby of the building.

The building plans now proposed for this site will require review by the City Planning Commission under its discretionary powers, as called for by a resolution by the Commission dated June 29, 1967, concerning the Portsmouth Corridor area, and this review of the building is to follow immediately after the street vacation matter. The street vacation was originally scheduled for Commission review June 12, but was postponed at the request of the applicant so that revised building plans could be submitted.

Based upon the street vacation matter as presented, and the revised building plans submitted, the following analysis can be made of the vacation request:

1) General traffic circulation: Merchant Street is one-way westbound. It carries a small amount of through traffic, but this is not a major factor in its present use.

2) Open space and pedestrian movement: While it is desirable that the public open space afforded by street areas be retained where practical, the scale of development that exists or is contemplated by zoning in the downtown area tends in the long term to favor closing of some alleys not required for other purposes. Where these alleys are in fact closed to vehicle traffic, equivalent means should be retained for through pedestrian movement to relieve sidewalk congestion and add to human convenience.

3) Access for abutting owners: It is clear that the proposed vacation would seriously impair access for the properties on the remaining portion of Merchant Street. Occupants of these properties include restaurants, offices, showrooms and wholesalers, most of which have access now to Merchant Street. There are, in fact, four truck loading doors for properties not owned by Transamerica, and a fifth building also relies on the street for loading. If the western portion of Merchant Street were closed, vehicles would no longer be able to move forward through the street after service to these properties.

4) Vehicle conflicts: As a traffic issue, closing of Merchant Street in the manner proposed would require the backing of trucks and other vehicles out of Merchant Street into Sansome Street, since forward movement would be precluded. This would, in our judgment and that of the Police Department, cause an unsafe and inconvenient conflict with vehicles and pedestrians on Sansome Street, and would inevitably cause a blocking of parked vehicles by other vehicles standing behind them.

5) Fire safety: Adequate service by fire equipment requires two means of access to each street, in order to speed the movement of equipment and to prevent the blocking of access to the street by a

single standing vehicle. A formal response from the Fire Department in the present case indicates the objection of that Department to the proposed vacation on this ground, and also on the ground that access to the fire escapes on Merchant Street would be impaired.

The three factors just cited, concerning access for abutting owners, vehicle conflicts and fire safety, all are sufficient reasons for rejection of the street vacation proposal. These objections could be overcome only by a closing of the street for its entire length in this block through new development, or by some method of carrying Merchant Street through to intersect another street and provide continuous passage for vehicles. There may be possibilities for such carrying through of the street, but it would be necessary that the design observe adequate standards including those for turning radii for trucks. In any event, no such carrying through of the street has been proposed by the applicants in the matter referred to the Commission or in our discussions with them, and none is shown in the plans submitted."

In view of the analysis which he had made of the proposal for vacation of a portion of Merchant Street, the Director recommended that the proposal be disapproved as in conflict with the Master Plan because the proposal involved a piecemeal vacation which would impair the access rights of abutting owners, produce hazardous vehicle conflicts and endanger fire safety for the adjacent properties.

President Fleishhacker asked if the Director might be prepared to change his recommendation if the dead-end portion of Merchant Street could be connected with either Clay Street or Washington Street. He replied that he would be inclined to question such a proposal since a number of people do use Merchant Street in the subject block and since a considerable amount of money was being spent to improve the flow of traffic on Clay and Washington Streets.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he would like to consider both the proposed street vacation and the discretionary review of the building plans jointly; and he moved that such a procedure be followed.

President Fleishhacker felt that it would be preferable to consider the matters separately.

Commissioner Porter stated that she agreed with Commissioner Mellon since she felt that the Commission's decision regarding the street vacation should be directly related to the type of building which would occupy the vacated street area.

Commissioner Brinton offered an alternate motion to the effect that each of the matters before the Commission should be considered separately; the motion did not receive a second.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he would be willing to vote on the two items separately; however, since the type of structure being proposed for the site might well have a great deal to do with the Commission's decision regarding the proposed street vacation, he felt that the two items should be considered jointly.

John Chase, a Vice President of the Transamerica Corporation, pointed out that the applicants had requested that consideration of the street vacation request be postponed from the Commission's meeting of June 12 so that both the street vacation request and the discretionary review of the building plans could be considered jointly.

Commissioner Carr seconded Commissioner Mellon's motion that the two items be considered jointly.

The Director remarked that some of the people in the audience might be interested only in the proposed street vacation and not in the discretionary review of the building plan; and, under the circumstances, he recommended that the Commission hear the two items separately.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 4-3 to hear the two matters jointly. Commissioners Carr, Kearney, Mellon, and Porter voted "Aye"; Commissioners Brinton, Fleishhacker, and Newman voted "No".

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION NO. 367584, AS REVISED JUNE 16, 1969, FOR PROPOSED TRANSAMERICA BUILDING.

Peter Svirsky, Planner IV, Zoning, read an intruductory statement as follows:

"This review is of a site permit application for an office building on the Transamerica property referred to earlier today, on the east side of Montgomery Street between Clay and Washington Streets, in the C-3-O (Downtown Office) District. The permit application was originally filed last March, but was revised by new plans submitted ten days ago, on June 16th.

Discretionary review by the Commission is required in this case under Resolution No. 6112, adopted June 29, 1967, for the Portsmouth Corridor area. Although such a policy resolution exists, the City Attorney has consistently advised that in any case the Charter and City codes authorize the Planning Commission to exercise its sound discretion concerning permit applications where the general welfare requires.

The City Attorney has further advised that even though Transamerica is not the owner of the portion of Merchant Street included in the site and therefore a building permit cannot yet be finally issued, the Commission can review the permit application at today's meeting. Because the Commission's recommendation on the street vacation is advisory only, the Commission is free to act upon the permit application pending a decision by the Board of Supervisors on the street vacation. The Commission will also have before it at a future date, probably August 7, a Conditional Use application for the parking garage under this building, but the need for that action will also not prevent the Commission from acting today on the rest of the building, subject to the later review of the garage. The Conditional Use hearing requires time for published notice, and pursuant to Transamerica's request the Commission's review of today's matter has been scheduled at the earliest possible date.

The site has an area of just over 47,000 square feet, This includes the portion of Merchant Street proposed to be vacated, but it does not include property along Clay and Washington Streets that will be used for street widenings.

The land has an elevation very close to the City base, and the proposed building would rise to a height of 853 feet above the street. The shape of the tower is that of a regular four-sided pyramid, 146 feet across at the base.

There would be a total of 510,000 square feet of floor area, and the individual office floors would range in their usable area from close to 17,000 square feet at the lowest level to 11,240 square feet at the highest level. The upper 235 feet of the building would have no floors, but would contain a certain amount of mechanical equipment. The exterior of the tower would be panels of white aggregate.

Three floors of parking would be placed below grade, with an entrance on Washington Street and exit on Clay. Above the parking, the lower element of the building would have nearly full coverage, and would have three levels. The street level would have a lobby and a bank. The second level would have another lobby, a restaurant, a terrace, and small offices or shops. The third level would be a plaza. At the corner of Washington and Montgomery Streets, stairways would lead up to the second and third levels.

These plans call for a complete closing of Merchant Street in the site. There would be limited pedestrian movement on the former street alignment through the ground floor of the building. At the third level, provision is made for later linkup to a possible raised pedestrian network to serve the buildings in the Portsmouth Corridor."

After receiving a request from television station KPIX that use of television cameras be permitted in the meeting room, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the use of the cameras be authorized.

Sidney Roberts, Attorney for the Transamerica Corporation, stated that the applicant's position that the street vacation request and the discretionary review of the building plans should be considered together had been founded upon a memorandum published at an earlier date by the staff of the Department of City Planning which stated that it would be difficult for the staff to analyze the street vacation request without having plans for the proposed building available; and it was for that reason that the Transamerica Corporation had requested that hearing of the petition for the street vacation be postponed from the meeting of June 12 to the present date so that both matters could be considered together.

President Fleishhacker remarked that earlier plans which had submitted by the Transamerica Corporation would have required the use of air rights over Merchant Street and not closure of the street itself; and he believed that building plans would have been necessary for an evaluation of that proposal.

Mr. Roberts replied that the memorandum to which he had referred had been prepared for the meeting of June 12 when the matter of the complete vacation of Merchant Street was to have been considered by the Commission.

Mr. Chase summarized the background and history of the Transamerica Corporation and explained that San Francisco had been chosen as the location of their new headquarters building because of "an affair of the heart". He stated that the site of the new building had been chosen because of its proximity to the present headquarters building and because it has a Montgomery Street address. Furthermore, the site provides ideal access to many public transportation facilities and to the freeway system; and, in addition, the site would have reasonable access to the new BART system on Market Street. The site lies slightly outside of the area of downtown which has the greatest amount of traffic and parking congestion, and those circumstances should be an advantage; at the same time, the proposed building would encourage development in the subject neighborhood which is presently plagued with an unusually large number of parking lots.

In conclusion, Mr. Chase advised the Commission that his firm had taken a great deal of care in choosing an architect for the project; and they had finally chosen a man who, in addition to having a world-wide reputation, had demonstrated an ability to be keenly aware of future environmental needs.

William Pereira, architect for the applicant, showed a series of photographic slides which he had taken to demonstrate the special characteristics of the site of the proposed building. Continuing his presentation, he showed examples of the types of buildings which had been considered for the site

before the final decision was made to proceed with more detailed plans for the pyramid-shaped building presently before the Commission for consideration. He remarked that the zoning ordinance allowed construction of a building on the subject site which would contain approximately 300,000 square feet more floor area than would be contained in the proposed building; and, while the staff of the Department of City Planning had originally recommended zoning for this area with a floor area ratio of ten to one, the building, as proposed, would contain approximately 70,000 square feet of space less than that standard would have allowed with bonuses included. The pyramidal design of the building would offer a minimum interference with views and would preserve and protect light and air in the area; and it would concentrate the bulk of the building's population in the lower floors which would be more accessible to facilities for pedestrian circulation.

Mr. Pereira stated that the pyramid structure, as first proposed, would have had a height of 55 stories and a base which would have measured 133 feet on each side. However, following discussions with the staff of the Department of City Planning, the Transamerica Corporation had acquired additional property at a cost of $2,500,000; and, as a result, he had been able to change the size of the base of the building to measure 150 feet on each side and to reduce the height of the building by ten floors. The discussions with the staff of the Department of City Planning had also encouraged him to reconsider his design of the first few floors of the building; and, as a result, he had decided on a scheme which would provide a three-level plaza which would serve as a base for the pyramidal structure.

Mr. Pereira stated that approximately one-third of the volume of the spire topping the proposed building would be occupied by air conditioning equipment and other conventional mechanical equipment which would be needed to serve the type of building being proposed; the remaining volume of the spire would be designed to house communications equipment at a later date. He remarked that construction of the new transmitter tower on Mount Sutro will prevent two-way broadcasting from that area; and, in that event, the spire of the Transamerica Tower could house transmission equipment for public safety systems, mobile telephone equipment, instructional television and FM radio.

Concluding his presentation, Mr. Pereira described the architectural details of the proposed building and showed another series of photographic slides which illustrated how the proposed building would appear as part of the city-scape from various angles.

Mr. Roberts stated that he had reviewed the memorandum which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning concerning the proposed vacation of a portion of Merchant Street; and, while he was in substantial agreement with many of the concerns which had been expressed in that memorandum, he felt that significant changes might take place in the area as a result of plans which were being contemplated by the Transamerica Corporation. With regard to present circumstances, however, the Transamerica Corporation had

engaged the services of Wilbur Smith and Associates, Inc., consulting engineers, to study traffic conditions on the portion of Merchant Street between Montgomery and Sansome Streets. During the peak hour of the survey, a total of 35 vehicles were counted on Merchant Street; and, at the same time, it was noted that Sansome Street is not used to its full capacity. As a result of their survey, the consultants had determined that the primary function of Merchant Street is to serve abutting establishments. The report went on to state that traffic volume on Merchant Street would probably be appreciably lower than that which had been recorded if the "no parking" restriction on that street were enforced; and it was noted that nine of the vehicles parked on the street during the one-hour classification count were not associated with the collection or delivery of merchandise. The report also noted that for the most part present service facilities on Merchant Street are adequate only for hand truck deliveries.

Of the three factors cited by the Director of Planning as the basis for his recommendation of disapproval of the street vacation request, Mr. Roberts felt that two, i.e., access for abutting owners and vehicle conflicts, should be considered as one. In his opinion, loss of access constituted the loss of only a private right; however, every property owner has a more important private right which consists of the ability to decide for himself if the value of a proposed development might more than compensate him for his loss of access. One of the owners of property abutting the subject portion of Merchant Street had made that decision; however, even if the decision had not been made, the individual would have had the right to seek legal redress for the loss of access. With regard to vehicle conflicts, Mr. Roberts advised the Commission that the Transamerica Corporation intended to acquire the properties abutting on Merchant Street which are presently owned by the Paladini interests, should the closing of the subject portion of Merchant Street occur. Following the acquisition of those lots, only three lots abutting on Merchant Street would remain under separate ownership. The owner of a 99-year lease on one of those lots, lot 20, had already written to the City Planning Commission stating that the effect which the development proposed by the Transamerica Corporation would have on the value of that property would more than offset the inconvenience which would be caused by loss of access if Merchant Street were to be closed. The second lot is occupied by a nine-story building which has a loading zone on Sansome Street and a freight elevator located no more than eighty feet into Merchant Street; and the third lot, also facing on Sansome Street, has a small freight elevator which is located at a distance of no more than one hundred feet into Merchant Street. The last two properties mentioned could receive deliveries from small trucks which would not be affected by the closure of Merchant Street, or they could be served by hand trucks operating from loading zones on Sansome Street; in either case, Mr. Roberts did not envision any major vehicle conflicts developing on Merchant Street as a result of the requested street vacation.

The third factor cited as a reason for disapproving the request for vacation of the portion of Merchant Street in the staff report had been the objections of the Fire Department. The recommendation of the Fire Department had been made before the Transamerica Corporation had decided to acquire additional properties on Merchant Street; and it was not yet known how that change of

circumstances would affect the Fire Department's recommendation. In any case, only one of the buildings abutting Merchant Street which would not be owned by the Transamerica Corporation has fire escapes; and those fire escapes are located only fifty feet, or one-half the length of a hook and ladder truck, from Sansome Street. Furthermore, given the proximity of the nearest fire station and given the street widening projects on Clay and Washington Streets, he did not believe that the closing of the subject portion of Merchant Street would pose a critical problem with respect to easy access for fire equipment.

Mr. Roberts noted that the responsibility of the City Planning Commission would be to determine whether the proposed vacation of the subject portion of Merchant Street was in conformity with the Master Plan; and, in his opinion, the proper relationship of streets to the Master Plan is simply that streets must serve access and pedestrian and traffic flow needs where such needs exist. With regard to the subject portion of Merchant Street, he contended that vehicular flow demand is almost nil; and, while the street may serve pedestrians, he believed that the pedestrian environment would be greatly enhanced if the proposed building were to be constructed. Mr. Roberts also called attention to a letter which had been addressed to Mr. Pereira from John S. Bolles, former chairman of the C-3 Study Advisory Committee, in which Mr. Bolles remarked that his committee had recommended that a major building, such as the one presently being proposed, be located in the vicinity of the subject property to serve as an "anchor" for the financial district.

In conclusion, Mr. Roberts stated that he hoped that his presentation had demonstrated that the proposed building would meet all of the legal requirements of the City Planning Code as well as the standards which had been adopted by the City Planning Commission to guide it in its discretionary review of buildings proposed for the Portsmouth Corridor. He believed that the proposed building would be a beautiful addition to San Francisco's skyline; and he hoped that it would be approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Brinton asked if he were correct in understanding that Mr. Roberts had stated that the City Planning Commission did not have an obligation to protect the private right of individuals. Mr. Roberts replied that individuals owning property abutting streets have rights of easement irrespective of any action which might be taken by the City Planning Commission; and, in any given instance, the property owner is free to determine whether or not he wishes to assert that right.

Commissioner Brinton stated that he was in total disagreement with the point of view expressed by Mr. Roberts; and, in his opinion, the Commission had an obligation to protect private as well as public interests.

Commissioner Newman asked if the Transamerica Corporation had any intention of acquiring Lots 2, 3 and 20, the three lots abutting Merchant Street which would still remain under separate ownership. Mr. Roberts replied in the negative.

Commissioner Carr asked if either the Transamerica Corporation or the staff of the Department of City Planning had discussed the proposed street vacation with the Fire Department since the additional properties had been acquired Mr. Roberts replied in the negative. The Director stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had not previously been advised of the transactions described by Mr. Roberts; and no confirmation had been received of the sale from the present owners of the properties in question.

President Fleishhacker, noting that Mr. Roberts had quoted from a letter addressed to the City Planning Commission by the owner of a 99-year leasehold on one of the properties abutting Merchant Street which would not be acquired by the Transamerica Corporation, Lot 20, remarked that the letter had not been received by the Commission. Mr. Roberts read the letter which had been addressed to the Commission on June 25, 1969, by William D. Runswick of W. D. Enterprises in which Mr. Runswick stated that it was his opinion that any inconvenience which would result from the closing of the westerly end of Merchant Street would be more than offset by the effect which construction of the Transamerica Building would have on the value of other properties in the area.

Commissioner Brinton remarked that Mr. Roberts, commenting on the traffic survey which had been undertaken by Wilbur Smith and Associates, had cited only the peak hour load of 35 vehicles on Merchant Street; and he wondered if the report had not also provided traffic counts for the remaining hours of the day. Mr. Roberts stated that 290 vehicles had been reported on the first day of the survey as compared to 378 vehicles on the second day; and he submitted a copy of the report to the Commission for its review.

Commissioner Porter asked Mr. Pereira if he were correct in understanding that the floor area ratio of the proposed building, including bonuses, would be less than ten to one whereas a base figure of fourteen to one would be allowed under the City Planning Code. Mr. Pereira replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Brinton asked Mr. Chase to indicate which additional properties had already been acquired by the Transamerica Corporation in the subject block at a reported cost of $2,500,000. Mr. Chase replied that Lots 9,10,and 11, fronting on Washington Street, had already been purchased by the Transamerica Corporation. Commissioner Brinton then asked the cost of the balance of the property presently owned by the Transamerica Corporation. Mr. Chase replied that the entire site had cost between $5,500.000 and $6,000,000.

Commissioner Brinton asked if he were correct in understanding that the combined cost of the proposed building and and its site would be $36,000,000. Mr. Chase replied that the building would cost approximately $30,000,000., including land cost.

Commissioner Brinton then asked about the cost of the proposed building per square foot of gross area. Mr. Pereira replied that the building would cost roughly $36.00 per square foot.

Commissioner Brinton noted that no figures had yet been available regarding the net rentable space which would be available in the proposed building; however, whereas the applicants had indicated that the smaller floors of the proposed buildings would be made available to people with smaller space requirements, he doubted that many tenants would be found who would be able to pay the rental fees which the Transamerica Building would have to charge for that space.

Commissioner Porter stated that she did not feel that the Commission should be concerned about the possibility that Transamerica Corporation might make a bad investment which would cause it to lose money.

Lloyd Pflueger, manager of the Downtown Association, read a prepared statement as follows:

"As has been noted, there are two issues before you today: 1 -- closing of a portion of Merchant Street, and 2 --discretionary review of the Transamerica Building. As we see it, unless #1 is granted, there is no need to go to #2. We strongly and respectfully urge you to allow Merchant Street to be closed so that this building may be built.

To quickly review our position regarding the building itself, I will read a letter dated March 6, 1969 from our Association to Mr. Beckett:

'On behalf of our Planning & Development Committee and the entire Board of Directors, the Downtown Association congratulates Transamerica Corporation regarding your recent announcement to construct new world headquarters offices in San Francisco.

'Our Association is thrilled by the daring design and feel that your structure will greatly enhance the downtown area. The building will be of such architectural interest that all visitors to San Francisco will certainly want to see it.'

The Downtown Association has appeared before this honorable Commission many times regarding planning and zoning matters. Our Association was one of the early advocates of a Planning Department so that controlled and balanced development could take place. We are very conscious of the need to keep downtown San Francisco neat and attractive - a place where it is a pleasure to work and beautiful to see. We are somewhere in the middle between the extremes who say: "no more buildings - we have enough", and those who say: "we do not want controls - let a developer do whatever he wishes". In effect, what we are saying is: "Let's continue to grow, but let's do it RIGHT" - and we say here, we think Transamerica <u>is</u> doing it right.

San Francisco needs Transamerica, and it needs Transamerica to have its headquarters building at Montgomery between Washington and Clay. That building will cost around $30 million to complete - which will provide hundreds of construction and allied jobs. When it is finished, it will put a property on the tax-rolls which will provide around $750,000 property tax revenue each year. That kind of money we cannot turn away.

And we need Transamerica for another reason: it is one of the world's diversified service organizations - it is an airline - it is a movie studio - it is a phonograph record making company - it is an insurance company - it is a title company - it is many things - a corporation with 23,000 employees, assets of over $3 billion, revenue of over a billion dollars each year, and in 1968 paid an income tax of over $50 million. It is a world leader. We want and need this kind of organization in San Francisco. This is a San Francisco born company - right at this location, and here it should stay.

Regarding Merchant Street, that portion is really not needed for the movement of automobiles. One should not use that street to get from Sansome to Montgomery - the street is really an alley to serve the residents. They can get along fine without the use of the portion that Transamerica requests. Transamerica owns both sides of the street, so let them use it as they desire and request.

We therefore respectfully recommend that you accept the vacation of that portion of Merchant Street to be occupied by the Transamerica Building - and then when you go to the next step, that you accept a building which falls within the existing code, and even falls within the floor area ratio which your Commission first wanted before you increased the F.A.R. with discretionary review privileges."

James Murray, Economic Development Manager for the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, stated that the Chamber had formed an executive headquarters committee to recruit more business to San Francisco and to increase job opportunities for San Franciscans. The committee had made more than two hundred visits to companies outside San Francisco explaining San Francisco as the "executive headquarters west". Mr. Murray submitted a copy of a Fortune magazine reprint which explained why the Chamber thought of San Francisco as the "executive headquarters west"; and he advised the Commission that the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce had voted unanimously to support the new headquarters building being proposed by the Transamerica Corporation.

Fred Martin, representing the Government Affairs Department of the Chamber of Commerce, reminded the Commission that the increase in the taxable assessment rolls which would result because of the construction of the proposed Transamerica Building would benefit both home owners and businesses alike.

J. Pardini, representing the owner of Lot 20 in the subject block, indicated that he had no basic disagreement with the position taken by Mr. Runswick, the lessee of the property. However, if problems should develop, he felt that it might be possible for the Transamerica Corporation to place a turntable in Merchant Street which could carry through traffic onto Clay Street or Washington Street.

Donald Geller, representing Mrs. Kaplan, owner of a six-inch wide lot abutting Merchant Street, stated that his client was very much in favor of the proposed vacation of the subject portion of Merchant Street.

Herbert McLaughlin, representing the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, summarized a three page report which had been prepared by SPUR and which contained the following recommendations:

"SPUR supports and encourages variety in building design within the context of a unified urban design format. It is pleased with proposals for slender towers rather than massive slabs, and generally finds that light-hued buildings contribute to San Francisco's "bright City" image. Therefore, SPUR does not reject the design of the Transamerica tower as such. However, SPUR does find a structure of such height to be wholly inappropriate to the part of the City in which it is proposed to be located. Any development of the Portsmouth Corridor must give prime consideration to providing a transition between the dense urban center and the intimate area just to the north; it must respect the unity and form of both the man-made downtown "hill form" and the natural Telegraph Hill; and it must conform to the scale of new development in the area set at 25-30 stories. All this is possible while at the same time taking maximum advantage of the existing zoning. New buildings over 300 feet should be concentrated close to Market Street.

Approval of the Transamerica tower will also require Board of Supervisors' permission to vacate Merchant Street. Any vacation to private developers of a public street must be contingent upon major public benefits resulting from the development. SPUR feels that this proposal in this location is not consonant with the public need in the Portsmouth Corridor.

The City Planning Commission should reconsider the zoning regulations which govern the Portsmouth Corridor to assure that all developers clearly understand the public necessity leading to proper and sensitive development of this area."

Harold Moose, representing the builders of the Chinese Cultural Center building, stated that he and his associates were excited about the possibility of new developments in the subject neighborhood; however, while their own building would be anchored on an east-west axis, the building proposed by the Transamerica Corporation would be anchored toward the North. He felt that it was important that the porposed building should be modified to conform to an east-west axis. In addition, he believed that Merchant Street should remain open at

ground level for pedestrians and for emergency vehicle access, perhaps becoming a type of street similar to Maiden Lane. Finally, if the proposed building were to have a plaza at the mezzanine level, he felt that consideration should be given to the manner in which that plaza might eventually be joined with other mezzanine plazas in the area.

Albert Meakin, representing the Citizens Planning Committee, indicated that he shared Commissioner Brinton's concern about the remark made by Mr. Roberts to the effect that the City Planning Commission did not have any responsibility for concerning itself with the welfare of citizens. In his opinion, street vacations were justifiable only if great concessions are given to the citizens of San Francisco in return; and he did not feel that the proposed building would offer anything to the average citizen. He felt that the location of the building should be changed so that it would not require the closing of Merchant Street; and, in addition, he believed that the design of the building should be modified so that it would be more in keeping with the character of the Jackson Square area.

William McCabe, representing the owners of Lot 2 in the subject block, spoke in opposition to the proposed closing of Merchant Street. He stated that his clients have a freight elevator located on Merchant Street which is used to receive truck deliveries; and he felt that it was important that trucks should continue to have easy access to and egress from Merchant Street. In conclusion, he suggested that some solution might be able to be worked out whereby through circulation could be provided by way of Washington Street or Clay Street.

Mrs. Hans Klussmann, representing San Francisco Beautiful, noted that the Commission had spent considerably more time considering the single building being proposed by the Transamerica Corporation than they had spent on the nine buildings being considered as landmarks earlier in the afternoon, most of which had been located in Jackson Square; and she felt that the people who were interested in the protection of Jackson Square were not being given a "fair deal" under such circumstances. She believed that the proposed Transamerica Building could be a real asset to San Francisco, inasmuch as it did have a certain amount of elegance and flair; however, she felt that the building should be located nearer to Market Street. She recognized that new buildings do bring extra tax dollars to San Francisco; yet, she felt that other important factors besides taxes should be considered, also, when new buildings are proposed.

Louis L. Levy, representing the owners of Lots 3, 4, and 5 in the subject block, stated that these owners had been trying to acquire Lot 6; and they had not been advised that the Transamerica Corporation had reached an agreement of sale with the owner of that Lot.

Sherwood Stockwell agreed that retention of easy access for delivery vehicles and for Fire Department vehicles was an important factor to consider in view of the proposed vacation of the subject portion of Merchant Street; however, he felt that another factor of major importance was being overlooked.

He recalled that the City Planning Commission, in its various deliberations on the downtown zoning ordinance, had been very much concerned with the Portsmouth Corridor area; and, in fact, the only major compromise reached by the Commission during the course of its deliberations was to allow a density in the Portsmouth Corridor area higher than had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning. However, at that time, the Commission had felt that the street pattern in the area would work as a built-in control against the merger of a sufficient number of the small and narrow lots typical of the area to allow construction of really massive buildings in spite of the allowance for greater density under the terms of the zoning ordinance. He doubted that it would have been possible for the Transamerica Corporation to construct the building which they proposed without bridging Merchant Street; and, because of his previously stated concern about the character of construction in the Portsmouth Corridor, he felt that the street vacation should not be approved. In any case, he felt, as a matter of principle, that open space should not be vacated unless a demonstrable public benefit is received in return.

Lewis Lindsay regarded the proposed building as a "monument to modern corporate arrogance"; and he wondered how much money the Transamerica Corporation would be required to pay for the vacated street area. He felt that the building, as proposed, had no artistic balance; and he felt that it would upset the graceful continuity of the Waterfront area. In his opinion, the subject neighborhood would have been better off if the produce market had never been removed; and, in any case, he hoped that the proposed building would not be approved by the Commission.

Gerald Cauthen, president of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, concurred with the statement which had previously been made by Mr. Stockwell. He emphasized that the Commission, in adopting the downtown zoning ordinance, had expressed his concern about the Portsmouth Corridor area by adopting a resolution calling for discretionary review of any new buildings proposed for that area of the City in order to protect both Jackson Square and adjacent areas against the construction of high-rise buildings. The proposed Transamerica Building was the first building to come before the Commission for discretionary review since the adoption of the discretionary review policy in 1967' and, since the proposed building would not meet the standards established by the Commission at that time, and since the building would not be suitable on the subject site, he felt that it should be disapproved. He stated that members of his association would be pleased to have the headquarters of the Transamerica Corporation located in San Francisco; but the building should be located on some site other than the one which was presently being considered.

Andy Butler, a landscape architect, thought that the important questions to be settled were where the proposed building should go and how large it should be. He did not argue with the fact that San Francisco needs additional business; and he indicated that he would be glad to have the Transamerica Corporation establish its headquarters in San Francisco. Nevertheless, he felt that the corporation should choose a more appropriate site for its proposed building.

Mark Doyle, an architect, stated that he respected the design of the proposed building; but he felt that the building would be better located in the desert than in San Francisco. In his opinion, no single architect should have the right to inflict such a design on the citizens of the City.

The Secretary stated that he had received two communications in opposition to the Transamerica Building during the course of the hearing, the first being a telegram from John F. Hogan, Jr., and the second being a petition signed by the members of The Environment Workshop. He indicated that the Commission had also received a letter from Ron Kaufman, representing owners of properties on both sides of Merchant Street at the west line of Battery Street opposite the Alcoa Plaza insisting that Merchant Street be maintained at ground level as a through street into Montgomery Street.

Commissioner Newman asked if another means of egress from Merchant Street onto Clay Street or Washington Street could be developed if Transamerica Corporation were to acquire Lot 8 or Lot 18 in the subject block. The Director replied that it was conceivable that egress could be provided in that manner; however, he pointed out that the application presently being considered by the Commission did not contain such a proposal.

President Fleishhacker asked if a representative of the Transamerica Corporation would comment further on the present status of their proposal to acquire additional properties in the subject block. Mr. Chase stated that a proposal had been made by the Paladinis and had been accepted by the Transamerica Corporation; however, the transfer of property had not yet been physically executed or recorded. In other words, the Paladinis had expressed their intention of selling the property and the Transamerica Corporation had expressed its intention of buying the property. More importantly, however, he noted that no one representing the Paladinis had spoken in opposition to the proposed street vacation.

President Fleishhacker asked if a guarantee could be given that the sale would be consummated. Mr. Chase replied that he could guarantee only one-half of the transaction; the Paladinis would have to speak for themselves.

President Fleishhacker asked what the Transamerica Corporation proposed to do with the additional properties if they were to be acquired. Mr. Chase replied that his corporation had no immediate plans for developing those properties, but that they would demolish the improvements when the Transamerica Building was constructed.

The Director emphasized that the Transamerica Corporation's intent to purchase additional property could not yet be regarded as an accomplished fact; thus, under the circumstances, he saw no reason to change the recommendation which he had already made regarding the appropriateness of the proposed street vacation. Furthermore, he acknowledged that Mr. Stockwell had been correct in his recollection that the Commission had hoped that the scale of

buildings in the Portsmouth Corridor would be controlled by the small lot configuration of the subject neighborhood and by the small streets, such as Merchant Street, which would ordinarily protect against the accumulation of large parcels of property under single ownership on which high-rise buildings could be constructed. He stated that he, also, wished to have the Transamerica Corporation establish their headquarters building in San Francisco; but he remarked that he had not been given an opportunity to prove his sincerity in that regard in working with the applicant or their architect.

The Director then continued with his comments and recommendations as follows:

"The review policy for the Portsmouth Corridor was adopted at the time of Commission approval of the zoning proposals for the whole downtown area. In response to strong sentiment expressed by property owners that the Corridor between Clay and Washington Streets should be included in the Downtown Office zoning district, and in response to indications of Commission opinion on the matter, I announced that I was prepared to recommend the change of district provided the Commission would also establish a policy of discretionary review in the Corridor, with particular attention to the effects of new buildings on views to be created or blocked, relationships to adjoining properties, potential development of the area as a unified whole, relationships to Washington and Clay Streets, and effects upon the adjacent Jackson Square area. The Commission made the change contingent upon such a policy, "looking toward maximum flexibility for new development in these blocks consistent with good design and studied relationships to other properties." The Commission was cognizant of the intensive City investment going into the Corridor area, of the need for continuity in the Corridor and of its place as a transition from the intensive office district to the small-scales areas to the north.

"It is our understanding that Transamerica was not at that time a property owner in these blocks. However, the owners of at least three of the lots now included in the Transamerica site were among those represented by an attorney seeking the zoning change. At the time of the Commission action the attorney, Thomas Feeney, was asked by President Brinton in the hearing whether he had any objection to the Commission resolution establishing the discretionary review policy. Mr. Feeney, according to the minutes, "replied in the negative and indicated that he was of the opinion that his clients should work with the Commission in an effort to achieve the best development of their properties in any case".

"Although it was not then an owner, Transamerica did express itself on the question of zoning in the Portsmouth Corridor. In a letter sent to the Commission by its Assistant Secretary in April 1967, before the Commission vote, Transamerica stated that it believed the Portsmouth Corridor should be included in the Downtown Office district. Members of the Department met with the writer of that letter. When the downtown zoning proposals came before the Board of Supervisors in September 1967, the Department wrote to Transamerica to confirm the

Commission's action in making the Portsmouth Corridor change, and enclosed with that letter a copy of the Commission's resolution establishing its discretionary review policy.

"In response to the assurances in this letter, John Beckett, President of Transamerica, sent a letter endorsing the Commission's proposals, especially as they related to preservation of the historical and aesthetic values of Jackson Square and North Beach. Among other things, that letter stated that "as the financial community expands, it appears only logical that the expansion will follow the now established eastward trend toward the Golden Gateway and the Embarcadero Center. The building activity in this direction will satisfy the office space requirements of the financial community for many years to come."

"Last fall, a representative of William Pereira, Architect, came to the Department's office to disclose that Transamerica was acquiring property in the Portsmouth Corridor, and he stated that he himself recognized the importance of working with the Department in development of a major building, particularly in this critical area. He described the possible forms being considered by the architects for the building, indicating that it appeared a building of approximately 30 stories would be the practical result. He was advised that the Department would like to have further meetings, and that it was prepared to discuss urban design terms of reference for the site to be considered in the Commission's discretionary review.

"Apparently Transamerica's Board of Directors reached a quick decision on the building design last December, and the chosen design was announced soon afterward. The Department staff first saw a model of the proposal January 6th. On February 5, after the public announcement, Mr. Fleishhacker wrote to Transamerica, calling attention once again to the Commission's discretionary review policy and asking that Transamerica submit plans to the Department and meet with the staff to discuss urban design terms of reference that would be appropriate for the site in the later Commission review of the street vacation and discretionary review matters.

"Several meetings were subsequently held by the Department with the architects and with other representatives of Transamerica. Written urban design terms of reference were given to the architects February 24, and these were also sent to Transamerica. The Department indicated its position very clearly, and the most important among the issues, it stated, was the matter of height. The Department also pointed out that although it was still possible to recommend to the Commission the proposal of a specific height limit for the Portsmouth Corridor area, an action that would immediately have put a freeze upon building applications that did not conform, the staff chose instead to meet with the developers in good faith to see whether another solution could be worked out.

"On March 11, a site permit application was filed for a building 55 stories and 1000 feet high. This application was found to be not approvable, because of a Building Code conflict arising from the location of building entrances in the tunnel under the building containing Merchant Street, and also because Transamerica did not yet own the right to build over Merchant Street as part of its site. In the meantime Transamerica was seeking to acquire additional property, and for this and other reasons the building was being redesigned. Revised plans were finally submitted on June 16th.

"The urban design terms of reference were developed as far as possible independent of the specific building plans that have been submitted. That is, the design terms refer to the attributes of the site and are not a critique of the building.

"Major office buildings always have a significant impact on the city, and they should always be undertaken with a feeling of responsibility toward the community. This is especially true in San Francisco, where the established fabric is finer, where all sites have a high degree of visibility, and where the public tends to be unusually aware of the values to be protected.

"The Transamerica site has in some ways a unique importance. It stands at the junction where Columbus Avenue meets the grid street pattern. It is at the center of the Portsmouth Corridor. It is at the very edge of the office district, enjoying good access by automobile but standing beyond a practical walking distance from rapid transit on Market Street. With the financial district moving steadily to the south and east, and with all properties north of Washington Street subject to 65-foot and 40-foot height limits, the Transamerica site should serve as a transition point sensitive to the mood and scale of adjacent areas, to the continuity of the Portsmouth corridor, and to the hill forms that now are set apart so well from the massive structures of the office district. If general urban design judgments are at all worthwhile for the downtown area of this city, they are surely of clear importance in this instance."

The Director then summarized the urban design terms of reference which had been prepared for the Transamerica site as follows:

"This site enjoys numerous natural and publicly-created advantages, including its location at an entranceway to the financial district and at the end point of Columbus Avenue, a diagonal thoroughfare cutting across the grid street pattern; its proximity to the Clay-Washington freeway ramps, to which it will be connected by newly widened streets; its enhancement by new construction in two nearby redevelopment projects; and its protection by special height districts limiting buildings to 40 feet and 65 feet from Washington Street northward to the Bay.

"The site is at a point of skyline transition, where the financial center stands apart from, and in contrast to, the low-lying buildings of Jackson Square and North Beach and the rising natural forms of Telegraph, Russian and Nob Hills, a transition that requires a lessening of building height and building intensity at this site.

"The site also holds an important position for street level transition, linking the office district with areas to the north and northwest, suggesting the need for easy pedestrian movement and for development that will be compatible with the scale and richness of adjacent areas.

"The site is at the center of the design corridor known as the "Portsmouth Corridor", comprising the blocks between Clay and Washington Streets from

Portsmouth Square to the Bay and characterized by new circulation systems and open spaces that give a prominent location for significant buildings to complement one another and the areas to either side.

A. The lower element of the building should be composed of a variety of intensive uses, with considerable pedestrian interest, easy circulation, and a scale and quality well related to the areas adjacent to the north:

1. There should be extensive coverage of the site by the building at lower levels, with pedestrian-oriented uses at and near street level and off-street parking either recessed within the building or located below grade.

2. In view of traffic volumes and conflicts in the area, vehicle access should be carefully handled, with no such access from Montgomery Street, and with entrances preferably on Washington and exits on Clay Street; east-west pedestrian movement through the block should be maintained, with provision made for a possible future upper level concourse to link the Chinese Cultural Center building and the Alcoa Plaza; vehicular movement through Merchant Street should also be maintained.

3. A continuous street line facade should be provided particularly along Washington Street, with a relatively fine scale and detailing harmonious with adjacent areas and a stepping back above a height of two or three stories; if any extensive open areas are created they should be above street level.

B. The tower element should have as its first consideration a sensitive fitting in with San Francisco and with the tower's own special setting, complementing other downtown buildings and the skyline as a whole as a strong yet human creation in an urban setting:

1. The tower should be generally rectangular in shape, light in color, as slender as possible within the context of the total floor area programmed, and of a height consistent with the heights of other buildings in the Portsmouth Corridor (25 to 28 stories, or 300 to 400 feet).

2. The siting of the tower should be normal to the east-west and north-south street grid pattern, centered on the axis of Columbus Avenue, and pulled back from the foot of Columbus Avenue to add to its visual effect and to enhance the transition to the blocks to the north."

The Director, occasionally referring to photographic slides, continued his comments and recommendations as follows:

"A review of the urban design terms of reference will show that the building now proposed conforms to these terms in a number of respects, particularly in the lower element between the tower and ground level. The design has achieved some positive results in creating pedestrian interest and in relating the lower mass to the adjacent areas. I might add that the building is also within the allowable floor area ratio for this site as expressed in the Planning Code. However, these are only some of the issues in review of this building, and they are not the paramount ones.

"Comparison with the design terms shows the following six differences between those terms and the building proposed:

1. Merchant Street is closed to vehicular traffic. This point has already been covered in the Commission's review of the street vacation matter, but closing of the street in the manner proposed is also not in keeping with the design terms.

2. It cannot really be said that the lower element of the building has a relatively fine scale and detailing harmonious with adjacent areas. However, a significant improvement has been made from earlier plans, and I am not disposed now to press this point strongly. It may be that further progress can be made as the architects give more attention to detailing.

3. Although the tower has been pulled back from the foot of Columbus Avenue, it has not been kept centered on the axis of that street. Such centering could add to the significance of a monumental building in the city, but the present shape of the site would seem to preclude this centering without significantly reducing the extent of the lower element of the building next to Washington Street. For this reason, I would prefer that this criterion now be discarded.

4. The terms concerning the general character of the tower are not met by this design, and this is a serious difference. This is unmistakably a "look-at-me" building, and not a building whose <u>first</u> consideration is a sensitive fitting in with San Francisco and with the tower's own special setting. It does <u>not</u> complement other buildings or the skyline as a whole, and it is an inhuman creation in an urban area that strives to be human and supremely livable. It is on this ground that much of the architectural criticism of this building nationally has been based, but I prefer not to deal in epithets as some of that criticism has done. Buildings should not be stereotyped, but neither should they be devastating to the fabric of the city.

5. The design terms refer to a building "generally rectangular in shape", and this does not include a pyramid. This is not because the pyramid form is inherently ugly. It is again a matter of the building fitting in to a degree with the established skyline.

6. By far the most important over-all issue, as the staff has repeatedly pointed out, is that of height. The urban design terms of reference speak of a height consistent with the heights of the other major

buildings in the Portsmouth Corridor, the Chinese Cultural Center and the Alcoa Building. This indicates a height of 25 to 28 stories, preferably about 300 feet but not greater than 400 feet if story heights approach 15 feet per story. A height of 300 to 400 feet for this site would give the necessary continuity of form to the Portsmouth Corridor. It would provide a tapering off of building heights at the edge of the office district to give both the office district and the surrounding hills their own identity. And it would reduce the threat to the future integrity of the Jackson Square and North Beach areas that will be produced by high intensity at Washington Street. It is the staff's view that the proposed 853-foot height simply cannot be approved at this location. Buildings of that height should be located closer to the evolving center of the office district at Market Street.

"It is my recommendation that the Building Application in question be disapproved. Such disapproval would of course be contingent upon the fact that it might later be made moot by either a disapproval of the proposed street vacation by the Board of Supervisors, or a disapproval of the Conditional Use application for the parking garage."

Having concluded his report, the Director distributed copies of a draft resolution which he had prepared for disapproval of the building plans. He suggested, however, that the Commission should first take action on the street vacation proposal.

President Fleishhacker asked again if the fact that the Transamerica Corporation was in the process of acquiring additional properties along Merchant Street would not affect the Director's recommendation regarding the proposed street vacation. The Director replied that several buildings which would still remain under private ownership would need access from Merchant Street; and, in any case, no real assurance had been given that the additional properties would be acquired by Transamerica Corporation. Under the circumstances, his recommendation of disapproval of the proposed street vacation remained unchanged.

Commissioner Newman asked if the Director's recommendation might have been different if the additional properties had already been acquired by the Transamerica Corporation. The Director replied that he was doubtful that his recommendation would have been changed solely on such a basis. Although the staff of the Department of City Planning had suggested design terms of reference to the applicant, those terms of reference had not been followed; and, as a result, it was his opinion that no public benefit would be derived from the closing of the street area. He indicated, however, that he would be prepared to offer a draft resolution to the Commission for its consideration which would recommend to the Board of Supervisors that adherence to the design terms of reference be made a condition of sale should the subject portion of Merchant Street be vacated to the applicants.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the City Planning Commission had repeatedly endorsed the closing of streets in San Francisco; and, in her opinion, it would make little difference if Merchant Street were to be vacated in its entirety since its value as a through street or view corridor had been lost at the time when another portion of the street had been vacated for the Alcoa Building. She asked the Director if he was opposing the closing of the street because of the design of the proposed building and if it were possible that he might recommend approval of the street vacation request if the design of the building were different.

The Director replied that he would be opposed to the vacation of any streets which are needed by other property owners for access; and, in addition, he would be inclined to look with disfavor on any street vacation proposal which

would not result in public benefit. With regard to the previous closing of a portion of Merchant Street for the Alcoa Building, he noted that no questions of access were involved at that time because the property was located within a redevelopment project area.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the vacation of the subject portion of Merchant Street be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Brinton, noting that a letter from Mayor Alioto had been read earlier in the proceedings, remarked that it was his opinion that the requests contained in that letter represented a totally unwarranted interference by the Mayor into the affairs of an independent Commission. He remarked that the members of the Commission had been appointed to advise the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on Planning affairs, and he did not feel it was proper for the Mayor to tell the Commission what to do. In any case, he intended to support the recommendation of the staff of the Department of City Planning, for a variety of reasons. Some time after the unveiling of the original plans for the building in January, he had received a telephone call from a representative of the Transamerica Corporation asking him if he intended to support the proposed building. He had replied that he would be prepared to support the proposal only if the occupants were willing to work closely with the staff of the Department of City Planning in modifying and refining their plans. Yet, not until strong opposition began to be voiced concerning the proposed building did the applicant make any effort to work with the staff; and, even then, they had made only "token" changes in the plans for the building. In his opinion, in the words of a newspaper columnist, the proposed building represented "an authentic architectural butchery" and he believed the photographs which had been prepared by the Director of Planning demonstrated that the proposed building would be totally inappropriate on the subject site which is located immediately adjacent to Jackson Square. He also concurred with Mr. Stockwell's evaluation of the Commission's previous position regarding the closing of streets in the Portsmouth Corridor area; and he believed that approval of the subject request for vacation of a portion of Merchant Street, allowing the construction of a high-rise building in the Portsmouth Corridor, would negate the previous policies of the Commission. During the present hearing, the applicant had at first reported only the peak-hour traffic figures on the subject portion of Merchant Street; however, as the result of further questioning, the Commission had learned that Merchant Street serves more than two hundred cars each day. He felt that Merchant Street is needed for traffic purposes. For that reason, and because Transamerica Corporation had shown a total lack of cooperation in working with the staff of the Department of City Planning, he intended to support the staff's recommendation that the proposed vacation of the subject portion of Merchant Street be disapproved.

Commissioner Porter stated that she had served on the City Planning Commission under four different Mayors; and she had never known one of those men to feel that they did not have the right to communicate with members of the Commission on important matters. She pointed out that Mayor Alioto, in the

letter which he had addressed to the Commission, had merely advised the Commission of his feelings on the matter; he had not told the Commissioners how to vote. In any case, she felt that the building proposed by the Transamerica Corporation was beautiful and elegant and that it would be an asset to San Francisco and she intended to support it with her vote.

Commissioner Kearney commended Mr. Pereira for the quality of the design of the proposed building and the Transamerica Corporation for acquiring additional property to enhance the site of the proposed building. However, he indicated that he was unhappy about the height of the proposed building which would be located in an area which should have buildings of lesser height to serve as a transition between the downtown core area and Jackson Square.

Commissioner Newman also complimented the architect for the design of the proposed building; and he indicated that he felt that the building would fit into the city-scape as proposed. However, because of the negative recommendations which had been received from the Fire Department and the Police Department, he was not prepared to vote in favor of the proposed street vacation; and he felt that the Transamerica Corporation should make an effort to overcome the objections of the Fire and Police Departments by providing other means of access to buildings abutting Merchant Street.

President Fleishhacker stated that he had been disappointed in the lack of cooperation which had been received from the Transamerica Corporation; and he believed that many problems had developed as a result of the applicant's failure to work with the staff of the Department of City Planning. The Transamerica Corporation's lack of cooperation was illustrated by the fact that they had waited until the last minute to present new facts to the Commission and by the fact that they had asked the Commission to reach a decision on the proposed street vacation based on the possibility that they might acquire additional properties abutting the street. If the Transamerica Corporation had worked with the staff of the Department of City Planning, the acquisition of the additional property might have become an accomplished fact at an earlier date; and the Commission might have been in a better position to reach a decision regarding the application. All in all, he felt the Transamerica Corporation had conducted a very bad program of public relations. He stated that he was anxious to have the Transamerica Corporation construct its new headquarters building in San Francisco; but he questioned the appropriateness of both the street closing and the design of the building as presently proposed. Essentially, he regarded the proposed building as being too high for the subject site; and he felt that many types of feelings of both the staff of the Department of City Planning and the community as a whole had been ignored with regard to the design of the proposed building. Under the circumstances, he did not intend to support the applicant with his vote.

After further discussion the question was called and the Commission voted 4-3 to authorize the Director to report that the vacation of a portion of Merchant Street between Sansome and Montgomery Streets, as shown on SUR-1169, is in conformity with the Master Plan. Commissioners Carr, Kearney, Mellon, and Porter voted "Aye"; Commissioners Brinton, Fleishhacker, and Newman voted "No".

The Director asked if the Commission would consider the adoption of a draft resolution which he had prepared which would request the Board of Supervisors to make the vacation of the subject portion of Merchant Street conditional upon the design terms of reference which he had recited earlier in the afternoon. At Commissioner Kearney's request, the Director read the text of the draft resolution.

Commissioner Porter asked Mr. Pereira if adherence to the design terms of reference recommended by the Director would require that an entirely new building be designed. Mr. Pereira replied that the design of the building would have to be changed completely if it were to be made rectangular in shape and with a maximum height of 25 to 28 stories.

Commissioner Brinton suggested that the Commission should first take action to disapprove the building presently being proposed by the applicant, and that it should then adopt the draft resolution establishing design terms of reference for redesign of the building and recommend to the Board of Supervisors that any vacation of Merchant Street in the subject block be made contingent upon those design terms of reference being met. He then incorporated these suggestions into a motion.

President Fleishhacker relinquished the chair to Vice President Kearney and seconded Commissioner Brinton's motion.

Vice President Kearney stated that he would be opposed to any action which would result in total disapproval of the proposed building; and he suggested that the matter should be taken under advisement for one week to enable both the applicant and the staff of the Department of City Planning to give further consideration to the proposal. During the interim, he felt that Mr. Pereira might be able to make some adjustments in the design of the proposed building which would render the building more acceptable to the Commission.

Commissioner Porter, noting that plans for the proposed building had been announced six months ago, judged that an irreconcilable difference of opinion existed between Mr. Pereira and the Director of Planning since they had not been able to reach agreement in that six-month period; and she doubted the value of an additional week's delay.

The Director indicated that he was in basic agreement with Commissioner Porter's statement.

Mr. Chase stated that his corporation felt very strongly about the shape of the building as proposed and about the amenity which it would give to the surrounding neighborhood.

Commissioner Porter asked if the Transamerica Corporation regarded the height of the proposed building as something that was important to them. Mr. Chase replied that the height of the building has been lowered somewhat as the result of the acquisition of additional land; however, if the building were to be lowered further, the gross floor area of the building would have to be reduced.

Commissioner Newman asked if it would not be possible to lower the height of the building if the site were to be further expanded by the addition of other lots. Mr. Chase replied in the negative.

When the question was called, Commissioners Brinton and Fleishhacker voted in favor of Commissioner Brinton's motion; Commissioners Carr Kearney, Mellon, Newman and Porter voted against the motion.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter and carried 5-2 that Resolution No. 6396 be adopted and that Building Application No. 367584 be approved. Commissioners Carr, Kearney, Mellon, Newman, and Porter voted "Aye"; Commissioners Brinton and Fleishhacker voted "No".

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary